

Laplanche, of Crookston, Minn., against increase of rates of postage on second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of citizens of Dwight, Ill., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of Gustav D. Brown and 49 other citizens of Charlestown, W. Va., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of J. L. Bracken and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, favoring repeal of the excise tax on corporations, joint-stock companies, associations, and insurance companies (section 38 of the tariff law)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chapter No. 1, of Columbus, Ohio, and Chapter No. 22, of Westerville, Ohio, American Insurance Union, in support of House bill 17543, relative to publications of fraternal orders—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of Huntsburg Grange, No. 1588, Patrons of Husbandry, against increase of postage rate on second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Caneadea Grange, No. 1139, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, against change in oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Hooker Association of Massachusetts for an adequate appropriation to construct a crypt in the chapel at the Naval Academy at Annapolis for the body of John Paul Jones—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1910.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Postmaster-General submitting estimates of deficiency in the appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department, \$34,000 (S. Doc. No. 348), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

Mrs. Mattie U. Boykin, Thaddeus C. Ferrell, and Mrs. Lula D. Meriwether, heirs of Thaddeus N. Ferrell, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 344);

Francis L. Ward and Eliza C. Ward, administrators of Marjorie Ward, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 345);

William H. Thompson, Ada A. Thompson, Michael D. Thompson, Andrew Thompson, and Jessie D. Thompson, heirs of William H. Stringer, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 346); and

B. J. Cowart, administrator of the estate of Aaron Turner, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 347).

The foregoing causes were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

CARE OF INSANE IN ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, by direction of the President, a draft of a bill to provide for the care of the insane in the Territory of Alaska, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to select a tract of public land and to erect and furnish suitable buildings thereon (H. Doc. No. 637), which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEYBURN subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the communication just received from the Secretary of the Interior introducing into this body a bill proposing legislation. We on a former occasion had to deal with that question. I object to the reference of the bill, because it is not in conformity with any rule or privilege under the law or under the rules of this body.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. With the consent of the Senate, the reference is annulled, and the Chair will return the communication to the department.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Idaho what is the rule or privilege that determines the matter?

Mr. HEYBURN. The rule or privilege that only members of the Senate of the United States may introduce measures for its consideration.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Do I understand that the Secretary of the Interior has undertaken to introduce a bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes. I will read the rule.

RULE XV.

1. All bills and joint resolutions which shall have received two readings shall first be considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, after which they shall be reported to the Senate.

There is a note to the rule, as follows:

NOTE.—Resolved, That no communications from heads of departments, commissioners, chiefs of bureaus, or other executive officers, except when authorized or required by law, or when made in response to a resolution of the Senate, will be received by the Senate unless such communications shall be transmitted to the Senate by the President. (Senate Journal, 1st sess. 60th Cong., p. 122.)

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator will permit me, what is the nature of the communication from the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is a proposed bill. It comes to the Senate accompanied by a letter signed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does the Secretary go so far as to introduce the bill into the Senate?

Mr. HEYBURN. That is a question as to the effect of the presentation of the measure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Chair may be indulged a moment, heretofore when such communications have come from departments the Chair has returned them to the departments and called attention to the rule. This letter of transmittal states, however, in its opening clause that the communication was sent by the direction of the President, and because of that the Chair submitted it to the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the Constitution allows the President to communicate with Congress on matters of public interest. It does not allow him to delegate the power to any other persons. A bill introduced by a member of this body is subject to an objection, and the question is one of consent and not one of right. The proper motion or expression upon the presentation of a bill is that the member of this body asks consent to introduce the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. This bill has not been introduced.

Mr. HEYBURN. What is its status, if I may ask, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is simply referred to the committee for its consideration as a part of a communication from a department of the Government, and is not introduced.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, no department of the Government is authorized to send messages to Congress. I object to its reference.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the point is well taken by the Senator, and that he could go still further. The President of the United States, I will say in all courtesy, has no right to send a bill to this body to be referred to a committee. There is but one way in which a bill can get before a committee, and that is by its regular introduction by a Senator, and to send a bill to a committee from the Vice-President's desk is practically to introduce it. Of course if the committee charged with its consideration thinks right to report it back, when reported back it will take its place on the calendar, if reported favorably.

I think, Mr. President, it is time that this matter should be dealt with properly, and it is a very much graver matter than simply one of sending a communication by a head of a department in contravention of the rule which has been read by the Senator from Idaho. It is a very much graver undertaking to introduce a bill into the Senate in a way other than that which the law undoubtedly alone authorizes, and that is by a Senator.

Mr. President, the design of the framers of our Government was that the three departments should be separate. If there is anything that is well expressed and the intention left beyond the shadow of a doubt, it is that. The success of our system of government depends upon the maintenance of that clear division between the duties and powers of each department of the Government. It is entirely different in this particular from the English system of government, under which the executive functions are, in fact, exercised by a responsible ministry, accountable to the legislative department. Those ministers are themselves members of Parliament, and are, in effect, a committee of Parliament. For those ministers known as "the government" to send a bill to Parliament to be enacted into law is no breach of parliamentary prerogative.

It is necessarily apparent to everyone that there is a constant encroachment in this regard on the part of the executive department. I am not speaking of any particular Executive or of any particular administration, for it has been so for years under administrations by Democrats as well as by Republicans, and there is nothing partisan in what I say. There has been a constant and growing disposition on the part of the executive department for years past to dominate and control legislation and to dictate its enactment by the legislative branches of the Government.

Mr. President, we see in the papers every day now that certain policies are being formulated by the executive department into legislative bills, that the provisions are being considered by the executive department, and that not only in this administration but in former administrations parties who belong to no branch of the Government are being called in for a consultation as to what shall be embodied in bills thus to be enacted. If I recollect aright, even in this morning's papers there was an announcement of the fact that a bill which has been prepared by the executive department and is to be presented as a policy to be carried out had been framed and sent to the printer, and when it comes from the printer it is to be sent to Congress with a practical statement that it is to be enacted.

Of course, Mr. President, that is aside from the particular point we have in view. It is a great breach of the privilege of the Senate, in my opinion, a most radical violation of the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the Senate, for the executive department to send a bill to the Senate in a communication, the design of which is that it shall in that way be introduced and enacted into law.

I understand, Mr. President, that the Chair has annulled the order, and there is nothing further to be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not yet done so. The Chair was about to say that if there is no objection, the reference would be annulled, and the Chair will return the communication to the department with a reference to the rule which it is alleged was infringed.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, before this incident closes I would be glad to know from whom this communication comes and how it is addressed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication is addressed to the President of the Senate and it is signed by the Secretary of the Interior. In the opening sentence of his letter he states that by direction of the President the communication is sent.

As the Chair stated a few moments ago, when such communications have come heretofore the Chair has returned them to the persons sending the communication, calling attention to the Senate rule, and has invariably received back a very courteous answer, thanking the Vice-President for calling attention to the rule. That will be done in this case.

Mr. MONEY. There would not seem to be anything to object to if it did not include something else. Is there anything else besides?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. I say so far as the statement of the Chair is concerned there can be no objection to receiving the communication from the head of a department, but does it include anything else besides the communication that causes the point of order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication contains the draft of a proposed bill.

Mr. MONEY. I still do not understand how the department could send a bill to the Senate to be introduced unless through a member. Is it a proposition from the Secretary of the Interior to have the bill introduced and referred through some Senator or upon his own motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not read the communication in full. The Chair is unaware just exactly what the proposition is. The Chair simply read the opening sentence, and seeing that it was sent by direction of the President he laid it before the Senate rather than return it, which has been the custom of the Chair when such communications have been received other than from the President.

Mr. MONEY. The reason why I made this inquiry is because if there is no intention on the part of the Secretary to have the bill introduced here on his own motion there is no object to be met in the point of order. If there is, it is so obviously improper that notice of it will have to be taken as a matter of course. But I do not yet understand that the Secretary of the Interior or the President has attempted to introduce a bill for reference through any other than the ordinary channels of sending it to some Senator for his action and approval, to be introduced either by request or on his own responsibility.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Shall the Chair read the opening clause of the communication to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MONEY. I simply want to understand whether the Secretary of the Interior proposes to introduce a bill or whether he was simply sending a bill here for someone else to introduce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the Secretary of the Interior understood that somebody would introduce the bill. The opening sentence is—

By direction of the President I have the honor to submit draft of a bill to provide for the care of the insane in the Territory of Alaska—

And so forth.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

Mr. MONEY. I do not understand, if I may be allowed a moment, that this is an attempt of the Secretary to introduce a bill at all. He sends it to the Chair. The Chair is to do with the bill whatever he chooses. I suppose it is usual for the Chair to hand it to some member of the Senate and ask him to introduce it on his responsibility or by request. If that is the attitude, there is no complaint to be made, as I understand it, and there can be no objection to it; but if it is an attempt to introduce a bill, then of course the objection made by the Senator from Idaho is very proper and timely.

Mr. HEYBURN. Had not the communication better be read in full, in order that the whole question may appear in the RECORD and point all the objection? I ask that the communication be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 29, 1910.

The President of the Senate.

SIR: By direction of the President, I have the honor to submit draft of a bill to provide for the care of the insane in the Territory of Alaska by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to select a tract of public land and erect and furnish suitable buildings thereon.

Under the provisions of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stats., 526), persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska have been cared for in a sanitarium at Mount Tabor, Portland, Oreg., at an expense of \$348 per annum per patient. Under act of February 6, 1909 (35 Stats., 601), after due advertisement, another contract was entered into with the owner of the said sanitarium to care for the insane for five years from and after January 10, 1910, at the rate of \$330 per annum per patient. This contract is, however, subject to cancellation at the expiration of two years from the date thereof. It is believed that the insane of Alaska should be cared for at some point within the Territory and at an institution provided by the Government for that purpose. The selection of a tract of public land as a site for the buildings and for hospital uses will obviate the expenditure of money for the purchase of land and confine the expense to the erection, furnishing, and maintenance of the buildings.

Very respectfully,

R. A. BALLINGER, Secretary.

A bill to provide for the care and support of insane persons in the district of Alaska.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to select and reserve not exceeding 1,280 acres of public lands in the district of Alaska for hospital uses and as a site for buildings to be devoted to the care, maintenance, and treatment of persons legally adjudged insane in that district, and to cause to be erected thereon suitable buildings for such purpose, and to properly furnish the same, and the sum of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for carrying the purposes of this act into effect.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I would have it distinctly understood that it is in no sort of captiousness that I made the objection to the reference of this communication, but having in mind—

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. HEYBURN. In just a moment. I want to finish my sentence. I had it in mind that at a comparatively recent date we considered this matter, and by a resolution, intended to settle this question, provided that no communication should be received from the head of a department by this body except it came through the President. This is the reverse, in a way, of that proposition. The communication of the President comes through the head of a department. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BRADLEY. What is the number of the rule to which the Senator refers?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is Rule XV. It is only in the interest, Mr. President, of orderly procedure and a proper recognition of the law of the land and the rules of this body that I felt impelled to make this objection, and I do not desire to be placed in the position of one who is criticising through a spirit of antagonism or animosity, but only as one who has regard for the rules of this body.

Now, in this connection I desire that there shall appear in the RECORD Rule XV and the resolution of the Sixtieth Congress on this question. I will read them in the RECORD in connection

with the objection, stating first that I object to the receiving of this document because it is in direct violation of a resolution passed at the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, which reads:

Resolved, That no communications from heads of departments, commissioners, chiefs of bureaus, or other executive officers, except when authorized or required by law, or when made in response to a resolution of the Senate, will be received by the Senate unless such communications shall be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

This is clearly in violation of that rule.

Now I desire to call attention to the constitutional provision under which the President may communicate with this body. Section 3 of Article II of the Constitution provides, in defining the rights and duties of the President, as follows:

SEC. 3. He shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may on extraordinary occasions convene both Houses—

And so forth.

I have read so much of it as pertains to this communication. It does not come under any of those rules and is under the prohibition of all of them.

I repeat, in connection with it, that it is out of no spirit of antagonism toward the department or toward the Executive that I make this objection, but merely because it should be made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 18364. An act to amend section 8 of an act to provide for the thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, approved July 2, 1909;

H. R. 18403. An act to repeal a portion of section 429 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

H. R. 18813. An act to amend section 63 of the act of August 28, 1894 (28 Stats., p. 567).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 5236. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 19548. An act prescribing certain provisions and conditions under which bonds and certificates of indebtedness of the United States may be issued, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by U. S. Grant Post, No. 327, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of a law directing Gen. F. D. Grant to be enrolled as a soldier of the civil war, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sterling, New Berlin, Greenville, National City, Edwardsville, Worden, and Ridgeway, all in the State of Illinois, and of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings-bank bill," which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wendell, N. C., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings-bank bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Slocumb, Ala., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings-bank bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of Sovereign Camp, Modern Woodmen of the World, of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission to the mails of fraternal publications on the same basis as newspapers and magazines, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the memorial of Henry W. Howland, of North Littleton, N. H., remonstrating against an increase of the rate of postage on periodicals, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Dairymen's Association of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to protect public health by regulating the production and sale of milk, cream, and ice cream in and for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Lawton-Warren Post, No. 5, Department of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of \$30 a month to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served ninety days in the civil and Mexican wars, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the American Association of State Geologists, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of mines in the Interior Department, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings-bank bill," which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Presbyterian Preachers' Meeting of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Chautauqua, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Hawaii, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chautauqua, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for United States surgeons, immigrant inspectors, and matrons on vessels carrying immigrant passengers between the ports of the United States and foreign ports, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of James M. Brown Post, No. 285, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend an act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12438) to amend sections 7 and 8 of the act of May 29, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian reservations, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect," reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 165) thereon.

Mr. FLINT, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2902) to establish an assay office at Los Angeles, State of California, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 166) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12316) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 167) thereon.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14676) for the relief of the Pittsburgh Brewing Company, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res 101) authorizing an extension of the tracks of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroad on the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 170) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make temporary withdrawals of areas of public land pending report and recommendation to Congress, or for examination and classification, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 171) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4653) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allot all the remaining unallotted lands within the Makah Indian Reservation, and to provide for the conservation and the sale of timber on such reservation, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 172) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4139) to provide for the sale of timber on allotted Indian lands, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BULKELEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 863) to correct the military record of John M. Miller (S. Rept. No. 173);

A bill (S. 864) to correct the military record of John Oates (S. Rept. No. 174); and

A bill (S. 1531) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party (S. Rept. No. 175).

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. WARNER), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2828) for the relief of William Martinson, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 176) thereon.

He also (for Mr. WARNER), from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1676) for the relief of William Martinson; and

A bill (S. 2397) for the relief of William Martinson.

He also (for Mr. WARNER), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3501) providing for the taking over by the United States Government of the confederate cemetery at Springfield, Mo., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 177) thereon.

Mr. CRAWFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3264) for the relief of Watson, Frye & Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 178) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5697) to authorize the change of name of the steamers *A. B. Wolvin* and *Cambria*, owned by the Port Huron and Duluth Steamship Company, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 179) thereon.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5167) to provide for an enlarged homestead, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 180) thereon.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, submitted a written report (No. 162) to accompany the bill (S. 4781) to reimburse Ella M. Collins, late postmaster at Goldfield, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance and supplies, heretofore reported by him.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a written report (No. 161) to accompany the bill (S. 4778) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance, heretofore reported by him.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred certain bills granting pensions and increase of pensions, submitted a report (No. 163) accompanied by a bill (S. 6072) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to the committee:

S. 17. Moses Ashenfelter;
S. 19. Anthony L. Bledsoe;
S. 29. Dewitt C. Gardner;
S. 32. Simon Jenson;
S. 34. Alexander Kinney;
S. 36. Robert Moore;
S. 54. John R. Clegg;
S. 57. Peter Vandyke;
S. 61. William P. Lovejoy, jr.;
S. 80. Carr Nicholas;
S. 139. William F. Rodgers;
S. 141. William H. Lewis;
S. 142. Benjamin S. Wilbur;
S. 144. George W. Edson;
S. 200. Samuel H. Parker;
S. 202. Thomas W. Knight;
S. 203. Joseph B. Fearon;
S. 239. Samuel W. Upright;
S. 242. George W. Mann;
S. 253. Thomas A. Crouch;
S. 265. Jesse Hiner;
S. 298. John H. Flier;
S. 340. Millard F. Lash;
S. 342. Francis M. Linn;
S. 344. Charles H. Mallo;
S. 348. James I. Moss;
S. 349. Oliver F. Pettibone;
S. 385. Samuel W. Hart;
S. 394. Charles W. Hoskin;
S. 421. Kate Gorham;
S. 444. Edward Waltemeyer;
S. 454. Joseph B. Driesbach;
S. 457. James Congdon;
S. 460. James Walter Smith;
S. 470. Thomas H. Brown;
S. 474. William C. Shute;

S. 480. Robert Stewart;
S. 570. Cassie Thompson;
S. 591. Charles W. Sager;
S. 632. Charles J. Decker;
S. 633. Harrison Sloggy;
S. 634. Daniel W. Ingersoll;
S. 643. Thomas E. Stanley;
S. 668. Charles H. Enos;
S. 679. Charles H. Golden;
S. 680. Harrison L. McGinnis;
S. 691. Eloi J. Hotton;
S. 692. Hiram D. Brown;
S. 718. Charles Williauer;
S. 722. James M. Stanley;
S. 728. Alfred Hemmant;
S. 729. Jesse F. Snow;
S. 756. George W. Muncy;
S. 757. Edwin Kerns;
S. 782. Albert Slates;
S. 790. William S. Woodford;
S. 859. John Fagan;
S. 969. Asa B. Henry;
S. 990. Gus D. Robison;
S. 1048. Henry G. Pickens;
S. 1098. William C. Bishop;
S. 1248. John French;
S. 1252. Gates Saxton;
S. 1253. Tilman P. Edgerton;
S. 1274. Alfred H. Livingston;
S. 1279. Thomas J. Vinyard;
S. 1288. Hubert Steinel;
S. 1289. George W. Hamilton;
S. 1295. Charles A. Hinman;
S. 1303. Thomas Hewson;
S. 1363. Hannah J. Dinsmore;
S. 1366. John M. Johnson;
S. 1400. William H. McCormick;
S. 1412. Volney J. Shipman;
S. 1428. Christian R. Shirey;
S. 1449. John Robertson;
S. 1457. Thomas R. Buxton;
S. 1473. Stephen Thrasher;
S. 1476. George F. Shoemaker;
S. 1700. Elias H. Funk;
S. 1733. Charles Allen;
S. 1735. Thomas Johnson;
S. 1739. Margaret J. Davis;
S. 1741. William H. Hasty;
S. 1800. Ozen B. Nichols;
S. 1847. Wilson Carter;
S. 1850. Crisley G. Hagan;
S. 1887. Charles Heathfield;
S. 1891. George H. Wheeler;
S. 1935. Andrew Alyea;
S. 2014. William D. W. Pringle;
S. 2018. William O'Brien;
S. 2026. Gertrude Smith;
S. 2035. Jacob H. Wolcott;
S. 2273. James B. Andrews;
S. 2295. William H. Johnson, jr.;
S. 2296. Napoleon B. Neal;
S. 2307. David S. Green;
S. 2315. James Olds;
S. 2333. John McGlone;
S. 2352. Joseph L. Kitchen;
S. 2355. John S. Taylor;
S. 2364. Martin W. Frisbie;
S. 2380. Marcus M. Chatfield;
S. 2383. George Auld;
S. 2384. Thomas Kerr;
S. 2435. George L. Duston;
S. 2436. Frederick D. Reed;
S. 2438. James Early;
S. 2449. George H. Teagarden;
S. 2454. Alfred N. Scott;
S. 2456. Charles H. Bartlett;
S. 2500. James C. Watson;
S. 2511. James A. Edsall;
S. 2512. Ella F. Lavery;
S. 2522. Allen Osborn;
S. 2535. Eli Estridge;
S. 2555. William R. Stephens;
S. 2557. Margaret Dempsey;
S. 2559. Leonard Briggs;
S. 2625. John H. Kimmel;

S. 2725. John Wharton;
 S. 2789. Catharine O'Keeffe;
 S. 2796. Joseph Thomas;
 S. 2812. William Thomas;
 S. 2814. Andrew J. Leonard;
 S. 2816. Wilson Hoag;
 S. 2819. Addison L. Ewing;
 S. 2821. Gillis J. McBane;
 S. 2823. Aaron Richardson;
 S. 2830. Charles M. Catlin;
 S. 2831. George P. Price;
 S. 2845. James F. Marshall;
 S. 2850. Henry Roberts;
 S. 2871. Jeremiah Thomas;
 S. 2874. Alfred M. Buttolph;
 S. 2875. Harrison T. Wilson;
 S. 2876. Richard Davis;
 S. 2877. James W. Gunnels;
 S. 2879. John T. Ream;
 S. 2972. Charles J. Jenner;
 S. 2973. Augustus Parish;
 S. 2992. Theodore Hardeband;
 S. 2995. John D. Harris;
 S. 3034. Ursula Dickinson;
 S. 3211. Milton Nourse;
 S. 3263. Nellie A. Farrell;
 S. 3268. Mary E. McKeen;
 S. 3270. Joseph Dudley;
 S. 3280. Anna P. Daggett;
 S. 3293. Cecilia E. Griffith;
 S. 3302. Charles H. Ellis;
 S. 3303. James Plunkett;
 S. 3304. Lewis T. Pierce;
 S. 3307. Charles Hanthorn;
 S. 3309. John W. Rowe;
 S. 3345. Thomas Mills;
 S. 3346. Edward L. Allen;
 S. 3355. Henry A. Van Dalsem;
 S. 3356. Judson N. Willis;
 S. 3357. William C. Markward;
 S. 3358. Frederick Basford;
 S. 3359. Cornelius V. Vansyckel;
 S. 3361. Stillman P. Cannon;
 S. 3362. John H. Cole;
 S. 3363. Nathaniel W. Davis;
 S. 3364. Patrick Dowd;
 S. 3366. Matthew B. White;
 S. 3371. Robert P. Murray;
 S. 3375. Pope Catlin;
 S. 3383. Lawrence Usher;
 S. 3392. Hiram H. Heath;
 S. 3444. William W. Townley;
 S. 3461. George Tyson;
 S. 3470. Henry C. Jordan;
 S. 3471. Henry R. Millett;
 S. 3473. Alonzo J. Nevers;
 S. 3474. William O. Needham;
 S. 3475. Joseph H. Holbrook;
 S. 3479. Parker J. Rhoades;
 S. 3533. Charles S. Davis;
 S. 3534. John W. Snow;
 S. 3714. Henry C. Campbell;
 S. 3745. Thomas Crayon;
 S. 3809. Michael Reynolds;
 S. 3810. Nathan W. Haskell;
 S. 3856. William Sharp;
 S. 3881. John W. Kitchell, No. 1;
 S. 3936. Harrison C. Wells;
 S. 3941. George R. Knapp;
 S. 3954. Eli E. Peck;
 S. 3981. Frederick O. McPherson;
 S. 3985. John Carrigan;
 S. 3995. John R. James;
 S. 4000. Amasa S. Condon;
 S. 4007. John W. Grissom;
 S. 4027. Sarah A. Musgrave;
 S. 4103. Joseph F. Healey;
 S. 4126. Richard Dobson;
 S. 4157. Corwin F. Camp;
 S. 4223. Leicester P. Riley;
 S. 4224. William H. McKinley;
 S. 4229. James M. Merritt;
 S. 4231. James W. Hester;
 S. 4232. Foster D. McKibben;
 S. 4233. James Pierce;

S. 4243. Richard Cullen (alias George Farrand);
 S. 4373. Haymond J. Powers;
 S. 4374. Charles H. O'Harnett;
 S. 4390. George H. Bishop;
 S. 4392. Joseph Douglass;
 S. 4395. Andrew J. Getchel;
 S. 4426. William Burroughs;
 S. 4434. Joseph P. Redman;
 S. 4435. John D. Harker;
 S. 4449. Nebet Hickman;
 S. 4451. William McCoy;
 S. 4491. John C. S. Wells;
 S. 4523. Charles H. Henshaw;
 S. 4552. Austin B. Wells;
 S. 4584. James Crooks;
 S. 4591. John W. Christie;
 S. 4593. Samuel Elliott;
 S. 4596. Frederick Frankhouse;
 S. 4598. Joseph Carl;
 S. 4612. Maurice Crimmings;
 S. 4634. Frank W. Richards;
 S. 4636. Martha J. Bussell;
 S. 4657. Edward W. Thomas;
 S. 4716. Thomas Lloyd;
 S. 4717. David Price;
 S. 4727. Jacob C. Cumins;
 S. 4734. Edwin N. Josselyn;
 S. 4736. Joseph Reither (alias Charles Debeau);
 S. 4739. Isabella Morrison;
 S. 4859. Elizabeth A. Burritt;
 S. 4864. Whipple B. Bradley;
 S. 4867. Byron C. Barrows;
 S. 4868. Ellen G. Brown;
 S. 4870. Charles H. Schuler;
 S. 4879. Andrew J. Madden;
 S. 4894. George Carpenter;
 S. 4895. Marcellus F. Cushman;
 S. 4897. David A. Jordan;
 S. 4924. John C. Allendorph;
 S. 4926. Allen N. Perry;
 S. 4927. Joseph R. Paradise;
 S. 4939. Harvey McCaskey;
 S. 4987. George P. Sanborn;
 S. 5068. Carlton M. Rhoades;
 S. 5083. Mary J. Hennessy;
 S. 5088. Sylvanus F. Westlake;
 S. 5100. Calvin P. Jefferis;
 S. 5124. William J. R. Waters;
 S. 5136. James R. Caudle;
 S. 5168. Newell Coburn;
 S. 5170. Edrick Adams;
 S. 5190. John T. Martin;
 S. 5194. John W. Dyson;
 S. 5221. Jane Moore;
 S. 5226. Libbie B. Smith;
 S. 5297. Edward A. Campbell;
 S. 5361. Henry F. Royce;
 S. 5431. David E. Stevens (alias David E. Tripp);
 S. 5442. Aime M. Golay;
 S. 5448. Harriet A. Wheeler;
 S. 5461. Joseph Robinson;
 S. 5464. William Franklin Stotts;
 S. 5540. Harriet V. Wheeler;
 S. 5542. Thomas F. Rowley;
 S. 5614. Susan C. Schroeder; and
 S. 5740. Jessie Green.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred certain bills granting pensions and increase of pensions, submitted a report (No. 164), accompanied by a bill (S. 6073) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to the committee:

S. 446. Jeremiah J. Hannon;
 S. 576. Caloway G. Tucker;
 S. 577. William H. Mullins;
 S. 593. Sarah A. Waite;
 S. 1221. Thomas Smith;
 S. 1462. Lucy M. Soule;
 S. 1597. George Baldey;
 S. 2003. Jesse H. Arnold;
 S. 2177. Cassimero Masters;

S. 2178. Peter C. Masters;
 S. 2276. Paul De Chainé;
 S. 2558. Gertrude L. Bradley;
 S. 2624. Jane Jameson;
 S. 2654. Richard W. Brooks;
 S. 2795. Nicholas Gradick;
 S. 2970. Thomas Topping;
 S. 3305. Ellen Scoggin;
 S. 3497. Edmond Damour;
 S. 3540. Curtis S. Parker;
 S. 3545. Mary P. Eastman;
 S. 3546. Charles Thomas;
 S. 3700. Nick Morrow;
 S. 4030. Hattie S. Carruth;
 S. 4681. Charles Roth;
 S. 4674. Anna E. Barnard; and
 S. 4866. Julia Walke.

PRICES AND WAGES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred Senate resolution No. 163 submitted by him yesterday for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the cost of food products in the United States, reported it favorably with amendments, and moved that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; which was agreed to.

ELIZABETH G. MARTIN.

Mr. DAVIS. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3082) for the relief of Elizabeth G. Martin, to report it with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 168) thereon. The bill has the unanimous indorsement of the committee, it is a trivial affair, and I ask the Senate for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$20,000, for the aid and support of Elizabeth G. Martin, widow of James P. Martin, who lost his life as the result of injuries received on the 6th day of April, 1906, by being run over by an engine of the Isthmian Canal Commission at Paraiso, belonging to the United States, being operated on the Panama Railroad at Paraiso, in the Canal Zone, be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be paid to the said Elizabeth G. Martin by the Secretary of the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. DAVIS. The bill has been amended so as to reduce the amount to \$5,000.

Mr. KEAN. I ask the Senator from Arkansas the reason of this bill. Have not the canal commission at the present time the power to adjust all these claims?

Mr. DAVIS. The committee considered that question. If the Secretary will be kind enough to read the report of the committee, it will be shown that it is a clear case of liability against the Government. The committee did not recommend the payment of \$20,000, but of \$5,000, and it is the unanimous report of the committee. This is a very just claim. The claimant is a poor woman, dependent absolutely upon her own resources, and her husband was killed while in the discharge of public official duties.

Mr. KEAN. But my point is that this is a claim, if there is a claim, against the canal commission at Panama, and it can be settled out of that fund and not by an appropriation by Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; upon an investigation the committee thought otherwise.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas to let the bill go to the calendar and we will have time to examine it. The calendar will be up almost any day and the bill will be reached in regular order.

Mr. DAVIS. I hope the Senator from Utah will not object to the consideration of the bill. If the Secretary will be kind enough to read the report of the committee, I am certain it can be disposed of at once.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Utah to object?

Mr. SMOOT. I object to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the calendar.

JAMES L. BRADFORD.

Mr. MCENERY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1232) for the relief of James L. Bradford, to report it favorably with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 169) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill first be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill in full.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for present consideration?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask if there is a preamble to the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a preamble, and the committee report to strike out the preamble.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the preamble is stricken out, it seems to me that the text of the bill will not be proper. The bill recites that "said James L. Bradford." It looks to me as though the bill will have to be recast, if the preamble goes out, and the preamble ought to go out, of course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire object to its present consideration?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the bill had better lie over for the purpose of making those changes. I do not object to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. ALDRICH. I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment shall hereafter consist of eleven members, as follows: Messrs. CUMMINS, chairman; PERKINS, LA FOLLETTE, LODGE, SMOOT, BORAH, DIXON, CLARKE of Arkansas, RAYNER, OWEN, and JOHNSTON; and that Mr. CUMMINS be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Patents.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKETT:

A bill (S. 6074) to regulate the hours of labor on contracts with the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 6075) granting an increase of pension to William M. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 6076) for the relief of the heirs of the late John W. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 6077) granting a pension to Adda M. Conner (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 6078) for the relief of Fred Klossner and Edward J. Klossner; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 6079) granting an increase of pension to William H. McCune (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6080) granting an increase of pension to George O. Ellsworth (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT:

A bill (S. 6081) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wellsburg, in the State of West Virginia; and

A bill (S. 6082) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sistersville, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 6083) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Glass (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 6084) providing for leave of absence to certain civilian employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request):

A bill (S. 6085) for the relief of Augustus Celaya and Joseph Celaya, sole heirs of Simon Celaya, deceased;

A bill (S. 6086) for the relief of the heirs of Franklin Perin, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6087) for the relief of the heirs of J. N. Blackwell, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6088) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Brogan, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULKELEY:

A bill (S. 6089) to correct the military record of Edward D. Gilbert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 6090) granting an increase of pension to Eugene E. Scherrer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6091) granting an increase of pension to John Harrison (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 6092) granting an increase of pension to Betsey Crandall (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 6093) providing for the granting and patenting to the State of Utah desert lands formerly in the Uinta Indian Reservation in Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 6094) granting an increase of pension to William H. Baugher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER:

A bill (S. 6095) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate an agreement with the Indians having tribal rights on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 6096) granting an increase of pension to Mamie R. Harrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 6097) for the relief of Dennis E. White, administrator of the estate of Buckner and Sarah Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 6098) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Odle (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 6099) to amend the act of April 13, 1908, amending the interstate-commerce act, approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BURROWS:

A bill (S. 6100) granting a pension to Phil Terry, jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 6101) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Brown (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 6102) for the relief of the estate of Silas F. Baker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE (for Mr. CLAPP) (by request):

A bill (S. 6103) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the allotment to Sooc-oog (Red Foot) or Bill Billy; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALE. I introduce a bill and I ask that it may be read at length.

The bill (S. 6104) providing for the appointment of Commander Robert E. Peary a rear-admiral in the navy as an additional number in grade and placing him upon the retired list was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Commander Robert E. Peary, of the United States Navy, a rear-admiral in the navy, to be carried as an additional number in said grade, and to place him upon the retired list of the navy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 6105) granting an increase of pension to Wiley S. Roberts (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6106) granting an increase of pension to Judson D. Haren (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 6107) granting a pension to Christopher P. Curtis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 6108) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6109) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a branch hydrographic office at the port of Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRICE OF FOOD PRODUCTS ON THE FARM.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the other day I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 154) concerning the investigation of the price of food products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There have been a number of similar resolutions introduced, and one, very lately introduced, covering the same subject-matter, which has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. With the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask that the resolution introduced by me, and to which I have referred, be referred to the same committee, in order that all these resolutions may be considered by that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and the resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has said about the resolution he introduced a few days since and had referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to ask whether this morning the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], who is chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, has reported, as I inferred he would do, from what he said yesterday, the resolution introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] on the 5th day of January, just a month ago, which was referred to the committee presided over by the Senator from New Jersey? May I ask whether that resolution has been reported this morning?

Mr. KEAN. It has not been.

Mr. STONE. Well, does the Senator have any idea when it will be reported?

Mr. KEAN. The "Senator from New Jersey" thinks it will probably be considered and reported at a very early date. I have three such resolutions at the present time.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from New Jersey, as I understand from some observations which have been made to me, is practically the whole committee. I think the committee has very few, if any, meetings. The Senator meets in his committee room, does the business, and makes the reports. I have no objection to that, except it seems to me that where the work of the committee is done substantially by the chairman he ought not to require more than a month to report a resolution one way or the other. I ask the Senator from New Jersey if his committee—if he cares to answer it—has been called together to consider this resolution?

Mr. KEAN. I can not answer directly the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri, but I think the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is in session all the time. I notice that there are always vouchers to be signed and some work to be done, and I repeat the committee is always in session.

Mr. STONE. It looks, Mr. President, just a little bit as if there were a disposition to sidetrack or to suppress this resolution. It ought to be brought to the Senate.

Mr. ELKINS. I think I understood the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to say that this morning there was reported a resolution covering this subject, substantially the same as the one introduced by myself.

Mr. STONE. I did not say so; nor was I aware that any such resolution had been reported.

Mr. ELKINS. I thought the Senator from Missouri said that; and I was about to answer the Senator and tell him that the resolutions are very different. The one reported by the Finance Committee is not the same in substance, nor in form, as the resolution I introduced. The resolution I introduced goes much further; and I want to read to the Senate in what particulars the resolution I introduced differs from the one introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], covering these questions, and on which the Finance Committee can report overnight, but the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate can not report in thirty days, and now refuses to report it to the Senate. Why this difference in treatment of Senators, this discrimination in favor of a resolution introduced by one Senator and against one introduced by another, both covering the same subject?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I have tried in the brief time that I have been in the Senate to follow the example at times set by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I believe that the resolution reported this morning by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] omits some very material things which ought to be covered in the consideration of this question. I shall not read all of the resolution which I introduced, but that part which is not incorporated in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts:

If, in the judgment of said committee, such articles have been increased in price by reason of the increased production of gold throughout the world, the expansion of the currency in the United States, or by legislation by Congress.

That means the tariff. Why do the Finance Committee and the Senator from Massachusetts want to avoid that question? There are a great many people who think the tariff increases the cost of living. I am a tariff man and a protectionist, and I am not afraid to meet that question and be frank with the American people, moved as never before on an economic question.

More than that, Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit me, I ask him—for I came into the Chamber after the present order of business was taken up—whether a resolution such as he indicated was reported this morning?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STONE. By whom?

Mr. ELKINS. From the Committee on Finance, by the Senator who introduced the resolution yesterday, being a member of that committee. It was introduced yesterday and reported this morning. It looks to me as though that committee worked quicker than the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. ELKINS. One in thirty days and the other in thirty hours.

Mr. LODGE. The Committee on Finance is a larger committee.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I want to read the remainder of this resolution. It does not take long when the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] arrives at the scene of action to look after certain things affected by the recent tariff, the passage of which through the Senate he secured as he wished and almost alone.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution which I introduced yesterday, and which I reported from the Committee on Finance this morning, as amended by the Finance Committee, covers the entire question of foreign importations and the tariff. I merely mention that. It does not do it at quite such great length as the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], but it is all there.

Mr. ELKINS. I fail to find anything about the tariff possibly being one of the causes of the high cost of living in his resolution.

Mr. LODGE. The reason the Senator from West Virginia has not found it is because he has not read the amended resolution.

Mr. ELKINS. I want to say further to the Senate that I had begun to reach the painful conclusion that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Finance Committee wanted to avoid the question of the tariff and other questions raised by my resolution.

Now, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. I hope the Senator from West Virginia will say the majority of the Finance Committee.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from West Virginia will allow me one word on that point—

Mr. ELKINS. It was gotten through overnight and reported this morning.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from West Virginia will allow me one moment. I made a speech here the other day devoted exclusively to that subject—the effect of the tariff on wages and prices. So certainly I show no disposition to avoid the question.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, the Senator made a very able speech on my resolution last Friday—said it was important and should be reported. Now, why did he change his mind and introduce a like resolution covering the same subject? I knew the Senator would claim that there was no disposition to avoid

the tariff and other questions as contributory causes, but the press of the country says there is such a disposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Which does the Senator from West Virginia believe—the press or the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ELKINS. I suspend pronouncing judgment just at present. [Laughter.] I want to hear more of the performances of the Committee on Finance, of which the Senator is an able member, and also from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, before reaching conclusions. It may be that this was referred to the committee of which my amiable friend from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is chairman, in order that it might sleep the sleep of death and avoid any investigation whatever. I for one, as a Republican, want to meet the question squarely, locate the difficulty, and ascertain the contributory causes of the high cost of living, and I introduced a resolution thirty days ago—on January 5—for this very purpose.

Mr. LODGE. That is not thirty days ago.

Mr. STONE. How did it happen that the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts did not go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate as well as the one introduced by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. It has gone there.

Mr. ELKINS. It was introduced yesterday, and it is already in the hands of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, having been reported upon favorably by the Finance Committee this morning.

Mr. STONE. It has been referred to him?

Mr. LODGE. It has been referred to his committee. All such resolutions must be so referred.

Mr. ELKINS. I can not understand the celerity, the quickness, the dispatch of the Finance Committee overnight as against the painful consideration and slow methods of the Committee on Audit and Contingent Expenses of the Senate. [Laughter.] I am going to read this resolution, if the Senator from Massachusetts is through asking me questions.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the resolution reported from the Committee on Finance reads:

That there shall be appointed by the President of the Senate a select committee—

Mr. ELKINS. I know that.

Mr. LODGE. One moment—

of seven Senators to investigate the cost of living and the prices of the necessities of life and of articles in common use, both foreign and domestic—

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I understand what that means. It means just what the Finance Committee want it to mean, nothing more. That is an easy way to sidetrack my resolution by adopting only about one-half of it.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution continues:

To ascertain, so far as possible, whether such prices have increased during the past ten years, and the cause or causes of such increase.

It is all there; and I can assure the Senator that there is no disposition to avoid the question on the part of anybody. That is merely the imagination of the Senator.

Mr. ELKINS. My resolution has slept the sleep of death for thirty days, and this one goes through the Committee on Finance in one short night.

Mr. GALLINGER (to Mr. ELKINS). But you did not send your resolution there.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator would send his resolution to the Committee on Finance, we would bring it in promptly.

Mr. ELKINS. I will send one to the Finance Committee in due season and see how long it stays there.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, when the Senator becomes a member of that committee he will get dispatch equal to that of the Senator from Massachusetts, but not until then.

Mr. ELKINS. If I were a member of that committee, I might get action; but I have never got anything from it, except the small drippings meted out to me in making up the tariff bill. I voted for nearly everything that was proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to get what I did for my State.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. BAILEY. I advised the Senator from West Virginia while that bill was pending precisely how he could get all he wanted, and if he had done that he would have gotten it. I did that in a private way; but I am willing to put it in the Record. I told him then that if he were to serve notice on

the Republican leaders that he intended to vote for the income-tax amendment to that bill he would get all he wanted. He did not do it, although he was persuaded in his judgment and his conscience that it was a righteous tax. Still, in order to keep the peace with the "powers that be" on the other side of the Chamber, he turned it aside and now he sees what he is getting. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELKINS. The next time I will consider the Senator's advice more carefully. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have had a great number of interruptions. I continue reading from the resolution introduced by myself:

If, in the judgment of said committee, such articles—

That is, the articles that enter into the cost of living—

have been increased in price by reason of legislation by Congress, or by any monopoly, combination, or conspiracy to control, regulate, or restrain interstate or foreign commerce in the supply, distribution, or sale of such articles, it shall report the same to the Senate.

As I heard the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts read, there was nothing about monopolies or trusts or combinations in it. I am willing, if the cost of living has been increased by monopolies or by trusts or by combinations or by the tariff, to ascertain the fact and let it be reported to the country. I do not want to dodge these issues, and I do not think the Republican party or the Republican leaders in the Senate ought to avoid them. I think they should meet them fairly and squarely. The people demand a full, fair, and impartial investigation, not a restricted one, not into some of the alleged causes of the high cost of living, but all of them.

The Senator's resolution does not meet the issue as it should. It leaves out several important factors.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the Senator will read—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will read the resolution reported this morning from the Committee on Finance, he will find it much broader than his resolution and that it includes many more subjects. It includes any possible cause which may exist to increase prices or increase wages.

Mr. ELKINS. Let us see if it says anything about monopolies or combinations or legislation by Congress. Why are these words left out and covered only by general clauses or terms?

Mr. ALDRICH. I believe the Senator from West Virginia is or was a lawyer, and he will understand the rule that reciting one cause may be held to exclude all the others. In the resolution reported we include all causes. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing that the Senator should put into this resolution just as many causes as he sees fit. There is no disposition on my part to dodge any investigation which may be made in regard to this matter.

Mr. ELKINS. I am glad to hear that acknowledgment from the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. It did not need acknowledgment on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ELKINS. Then I am glad none was needed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I never had any such idea, and I have none now. The resolution reported by the Committee on Finance, I repeat, is much broader and more comprehensive than that offered by the Senator from West Virginia. If, however, he desires to specify certain matters of inquiry, I am sure there will be no objection on anybody's part to their being inserted.

Mr. ELKINS. I still do not find anything in the resolution about trusts, combinations, monopolies, or conspiracies to control, regulate, or restrain interstate or foreign commerce.

While I may understand what the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Massachusetts mean, the great public will not; it will reach the conclusion the Senate wishes to avoid those questions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit, I will venture to suggest to him that when this resolution or when some resolution shall be reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it will then be competent for the Senator from West Virginia to offer amendments to it, if he chooses, and, if a majority of the Senate agrees, to put into the resolution such language as the Senator thinks ought to be added to it and will accomplish his purpose. He can not be foreclosed from offering his resolution as a substitute, if he wishes, for any resolution that may be reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not spell anything out of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I do not see how they are pertinent. I have got certain rights, say, a long way off. I know some of my rights—I do not, however, know them all as well as the distinguished Senator does—but in due season I will try to get my rights and the rights of the people, stand by, and defend them. I shall make a statement hereafter.

I admit that the Finance Committee, which reported the resolution this morning, has made certain additions to the resolution as introduced, but I do not see the necessity of taking it from me by keeping it in committee. I know the other side discredits me as a protectionist, but I did not think the Finance Committee did, and was afraid to let my resolution pass. I do not know what it all means; but, Mr. President, the country will take notice of this. We can not impose upon the intelligence of 80,000,000 people; we can not deceive them, and we should not try. A great many people believe that these monopolies, trusts, conspiracies, and combinations in restraint of trade have contributed to this disastrous condition in the increased cost of living.

Mr. BAILEY. And that the tariff contributed to the monopolies and trusts.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not say that. Mr. President, I thought that I was answering the question of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] when I rose to show, as I think I ought to do, the difference between these resolutions. I have taken up more time of the Senate than I wished, but I had to answer the questions that were put to me.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia seems to have given a great deal of attention to this subject, as he does to all subjects in which he is interested. Perhaps he will be willing to state to the Senate whether he thinks prices have been increased by the tariff or by the trusts. Perhaps he has already made up his mind upon that subject, and can tell us what he personally thinks about it—whether the tariff is responsible for the increased prices and the increased cost of living, or whether the trusts are responsible. Perhaps he already knows something about the subject and may be willing to state now to the Senate what he thinks about it.

Mr. ELKINS. In order to get my resolution reported and acted upon I am not called upon to give my opinion. Later on I may. That is what I wanted the committee selected for. I wanted it to get that information; and I did not think there would be any objection to it. Indeed, I am surprised that any Senator should oppose the resolution—substitute one in its stead and rush it through.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there has been no objection on anybody's part; and so far as I am concerned—and I have no doubt so far as the Senate is concerned—the investigation into this subject should be made as broad and as comprehensive as possible. If the Senator from West Virginia or any other Senator wants any particular subject investigated, I am sure he will have a chance to have it investigated to his heart's content.

Mr. ELKINS. It does not seem so. I can not get my resolution reported when it is broader, more comprehensive, and fuller than the resolution reported overnight by the Finance Committee, while my resolution is still in committee.

But, Mr. President, all resolutions ought to have the same treatment at the hands of the committee and be reported promptly. If all these resolutions are not put to sleep in the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I will make known my views, if I have a chance, later on. The Senator wants me to answer his questions. I might put half a dozen questions to him now and take up the time of the Senate about various matters. Is he in favor of this or in favor of that? I want a fair chance at the hands of the Senate and the Republican party, that is all, for all the people of the United States, no matter what I believe individually, to know, if possible, the real causes of the alarming advance in the cost of living; and I do not think it wise in the Republicans of the Senate to restrict the investigation of this subject. What is to be gained by refusing action on a resolution introduced a month ago and rushing one through introduced yesterday, except it be to control the make-up of the committee of investigation to suit the Finance Committee?

Mr. STONE. But they are not willing—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Rhode Island said that the Senator from West Virginia could have any subject investigated by the proposed committee that he desired investigated, but I judge from the course of this matter that it is not desired

by the Senator from Rhode Island or his Republican colleagues on the committee and others associated with him that the Senator from West Virginia should himself have any voice in making the inquiry. He can request the committee to do it, but he is not permitted to do it himself; and hence the resolution he offered is sidetracked by the introduction, through the Senator from Massachusetts, of another resolution of substantially the same kind, so that it may be reported here and a committee created leaving the Senator from West Virginia off.

I do not know the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia as to the subject-matter under discussion and embraced in the resolution; I do not know what he thinks about the tariff or combinations or trusts raising or reducing the prices of commodities; but I do think that, if it be not discourteous, what has been done to him is a manifest indication on the part of those who are seemingly in control of this business of lack of confidence in the attitude of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ELKINS. I absolve the Senator from Massachusetts and the Finance Committee for any intentional discourtesies in what has been done; but it does seem to me I have not had fair treatment in the desire of these Senators to control the investigation, I can not imagine for what purpose.

Mr. President, since yesterday and the introduction of the resolution by the Senator from Massachusetts, I have despaired of ever having anything to say or do about the investigation of the cost of living, although I introduced the first resolution calling for an investigation a month ago. The one I introduced I suppose will never see daylight, and as to the one that is substituted for mine, I will have nothing to say except as a member of the Senate in open session. I thought, when I introduced this resolution thirty days ago, that I might have something to say on the subject. I had definite ideas about the investigation, and I introduced the resolution in good faith to have an investigation. I made the language as broad as I could to cover all these questions and show to the country that the Senate was not afraid to investigate the tariff and monopolies and trusts and combinations. It seems the Finance Committee is determined to control this investigation, just as it did the tariff. Both Senators now agree that that was left out when the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts was introduced.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely mistaken in his statement of facts. The words which were in the original resolution which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts as to the causes have not been changed at all. The committee to be appointed will investigate the causes and report upon all causes. That, of course, includes trusts, the tariff, and everything else. If the Senator desires to specify when this resolution comes before the Senate—it is not before the Senate now at all, and this debate is entirely out of order in a sense, as it is proceeding by unanimous consent—but when the resolution is before the Senate, if it is not specific enough, I have no doubt the Senate will be very glad to put in specific cases or specific inquiries in reference to this matter.

Mr. ELKINS. This does not reconcile me to the action of the Finance Committee in taking charge of the investigation, when I introduced the first resolution on the subject. Such a proceeding is not usual or regular in this body.

I would have been through long ago if I had not been interrupted. The Senator says that the tariff should be one of the causes investigated. I am not prepared to admit as much as the Senator does in regard to his own child, the tariff bill. It was nearly his production in the Senate, for whatever he said, I think, controlled what went into the bill and what was left out.

Mr. President, I am apprehensive the action of certain Senators will not be understood. I picked up one of the morning papers, the New York Journal, I think—

Mr. KEAN. The New York American.

Mr. ELKINS. The American, I believe. I will not put this extract in the RECORD now. It has some references to my friend the Senator from Rhode Island and I do not agree with them at all. Nobody rivals me in admiration of him, his good qualities, his ability, and his intelligence. His leadership is able, though terrific and terrible at times, but I generally submit to it gracefully, as I have done on many occasions.

Amongst the questions asked by the American, in speaking of the extraordinary action of the Finance Committee, which is getting to be a very good administration paper of late and entitled to respect in the Senate, "Is it a tariff whitewash?" Why did that creep into the public mind overnight? "Is the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts a tariff whitewash?" I will not read more of this article now, but there is an abundance of it. The country is alarmed. Here is a serious question. Thirty days ago I introduced, as I have

said, in the best of faith, a resolution comprehensive and broad, providing for a committee of Senators, to be selected by the President of the Senate, to go into this subject, and up to this moment I can not get any action either by clamoring for action in open Senate or by persuasion of the chairman on Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with all the smooth words I can command. I can not get it out of the pigeonholes of his committee. There ought to be some rule by which a Senator can get a bill or a resolution reported.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. BACON. The article to which the Senator alludes is very suggestive, and I hope he will read it now. He says he will not do it now, emphasizing "now." If he intends to do so at another time, I think this is the time, for if there is a suggestion as to a tariff whitewash, we would like to know it.

Mr. ELKINS. I think it will keep.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator will permit me, I want to warn the Senator from West Virginia again that he is sacrificing his opportunities in order to keep the peace over there. If the Senator from West Virginia becomes an insurgent rife he will get what is coming to him and to his State.

While I am on my feet, with the permission of the Senator, I want to express a difference of opinion with my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. It was not that the majority distrusted the Senator from West Virginia that moved them to take this matter out of his hands; it was the very well-defined fear that they could not trust him to go around the tariff question. It was a belief in their minds that if the Senator from West Virginia finds the tariff responsible for any of these hardships and these high prices he will frankly say so, because the Senator from West Virginia has more than once exhibited an inclination to get off of that reservation over there. [Laughter.] I would not be very much surprised to see the Senator from West Virginia within the next fortnight in agreement with some of the most conspicuous and useful insurgents in this body. I think he is getting tired of belonging to the anarchists. I think he is getting ready to belong to the insurgents.

Mr. ELKINS. One word more, Mr. President, and only one. I could not get off the reservation during the consideration of the tariff. I was afraid to try. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] knows why. The Senate knows why. But now I have a little more sea room. I do not have to in order to get scant justice. I have some definite notions about this matter, and some definite notions about the rights of a Senator when he introduces a resolution in the Senate covering a question about which another Senator introduces a similar resolution and has it referred to his committee and reports it next morning. I have definite notions as to whether this is proper treatment. Had the Senator from Massachusetts or the Finance Committee conferred with me, and said it was desirable that he should be chairman of the committee on the proposed investigation, especially in view of the fact the Finance Committee dictated the tariff, I would have cheerfully yielded.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from West Virginia permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. In other words, the Senator rather acquiesced in the statement made by the Senator from Texas that the Senator from West Virginia, in his conscience and judgment, approved of an income tax. He did not deny it. I am sure the Senator acquiesced in it. Now that the Senator has more liberty, and is not in slavery this time, I suppose he will be in favor, when this question shall come again, of a substantial revision of the tariff in regard to the sugar schedule. I am almost persuaded that the Senator's judgment and conscience were in favor of such a revision when our last tariff bill was passed.

Mr. ELKINS. I voted for the income tax. I need not give my reasons now. I was on the reservation. I do not have to stay there always. The tariff is considered only once in about six or seven years. Some Senators have freedom the balance of the time. I am somewhat in fear we will have no investigation. I do not know why this method and this procedure should obtain in respect to my resolution. I can not find out the reasons for this unusual course. I generally go to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], when anything is not going right, and I ask what is the matter. He generally puts me right, or he says—when the tariff bill is under consideration—"You had better keep right where you are, if you know what is good for you." [Laughter.] But, Mr. President, seriously, I do not believe that this whole pro-

ceeding is the kind of treatment that a Senator should have in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from West Virginia permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire demands the regular order. The regular order is the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. BACON. I desire to know what the Senator from West Virginia meant by having more water to swim in now.

COMPANIES ENGAGED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I move that the bill (S. 305) to regulate the issue of securities by transportation, telegraph, and telephone companies engaged in interstate commerce, for the purpose of better protecting the people against unreasonable rates and charges, now on the table, be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. DOLLIVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 166), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 166.

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee during the Sixty-first Congress, and to have the same printed for its use, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 164), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 164.

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or a subcommittee thereof, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 167) was read, as follows

Senate resolution 167.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized to purchase and furnish for the use of the Committee on Revision of the Laws the United States Supreme Court Reports with Digest and the Federal Reporter with Digest, to be paid for from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the statute the resolution will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. A word of explanation, with the permission of the Senate.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws is not supplied with either the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States or the federal courts, and access to the library is very inconvenient. Any lawyer will understand that when you send for one book, it suggests that you send for others, and so on. It is an endless chain. It seems to me if any committee of the Senate, in addition to the Judiciary Committee, should have these law books in the committee room, it is a committee appointed for the purpose of revising the laws. I have purchased a number of law books, but this is rather a heavy contract. While I have these books in another library, I have them not here.

Mr. KEAN. Do I understand that this is a committee of the Senate?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the committee appointed by the President of the Senate to act conjointly with the committee of the House.

Mr. KEAN. It is a joint committee, created by law.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes. It is a joint committee created by law.

Mr. KEAN. It is not a Senate committee.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, it is partly a Senate committee. That is rather a fine-drawn distinction. The House, I may say, has provided the House committee with these books and many others; with quite an extensive library. The Committee on the Revision of the Laws, which was a standing committee of this body until a few months since, may, or may not, have had these books. I do not know. I was not a member of it. I have been a member of the joint committee for some time, and

have been working at a very great disadvantage. I think an appeal for the law books necessary for the work to be performed ought not to be rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The law requires that the resolution shall go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate before any action can be taken upon it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have no objection to its reference, but I want these books.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING.

Mr. ELKINS. I offer a resolution, and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Finance. I hope to have as speedy action on it as I had on the other resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 165) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 165.

Resolved, That there shall be appointed by the President of the Senate a select committee of seven Senators, with authority to sit during the session of the Senate or during the recess of Congress, either as a committee or by a subcommittee, with instructions to make an exhaustive investigation into the cost of living and any increase in the same since 1900; to ascertain whether the price of the necessities of life which enter into the general use and consumption of the people have since the year 1900 been increased; and if so, to ascertain the cause or causes which have influenced said increase. In making such investigation special attention shall be given by the committee to the subject of wages and income, and if the increase in the same has kept pace with the increase in the cost of living; increased price, if any, of such articles as meat, grain, provisions, rents, cotton, wool, clothing, lumber, coal, iron, oil, brick, and cement; stating in said report the price to the producer, the wholesaler or jobber, the retailer, and the consumer at which said articles included in the investigation by said committee were distributed and sold in the year 1900, and the price for their disposition and sale at the present time. It shall further be the duty of said committee to ascertain the cost of production of said articles and the cost of their distribution and sale when in the hands of the wholesaler or jobber and the retailer between the same periods. If, in the judgment of said committee, such articles have been increased in price by reason of the increased production of gold throughout the world and the expansion of the currency in the United States, or legislation by Congress, or by any monopoly, combination, or conspiracy to control, regulate, or restrain interstate or foreign commerce in the supply, distribution, or sale of such articles, it shall report the same to the Senate, with suggestions or recommendations as to the remedy to be applied to reduce the cost of living, and accompany its report with such bill or bills as will, in the opinion of the committee, correct and remove the cause or causes which have enhanced the price of said articles. Said committee or subcommittee is authorized to employ experts, administer oaths, take testimony, send for persons and papers, employ a stenographer to report its hearings, and to have such hearings printed.

And all necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 18364. An act to amend section 8 of an act to provide for the thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, approved July 2, 1909, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 18403. An act to repeal a portion of section 429 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 18813. An act to amend section 63 of the act of August 28, 1894 (28 Stat., p. 567), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITORIES.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the bill (S. 5876) to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest, with security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CARTER. Let the amendment be again reported for the information of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That money deposited in the banks and secured to the satisfaction of the board of trustees, as herein provided, shall only be withdrawn to pay the depositors and other obligations of the Government under this act, and shall not be withdrawn for investment so long as the banks are willing to retain it and pay the rate of interest prescribed, from time to time, by said board, which rate shall not be less than 2½ per cent per annum.

Mr. CARTER. I think the amendment as thus perfected is satisfactory.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I certainly can not vote for this amendment. Its provisions will enable this board to fix an arbitrary rate of interest that may be higher than the banks of a State would be willing to pay, and if they do, they can withdraw all the funds deposited in the banks of that State and invest them in any way they see fit. If the rate that prevails in some other State should be 3 or 3½ per cent and the board should fix that as the rate, then that would be the standard rate throughout the Union, and it would permit this board in that way to get control of this enormous fund, to be used in investments, and it would nullify the very purpose which the Senator from Utah had in mind in offering his original amendment.

Mr. CARTER. It seems to me the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, providing that the rate fixed shall be uniform throughout the United States, would, taken in connection with this condition, remove any such possible contingency. If the rates were to be regulated in the respective States according to the wishes of the board, I can conceive it might be that the rate would be fixed too high in some States, but if the rate is required to be uniform throughout the States and Territories, I can not imagine that the board would ever so raise the rate as to liberate all the money from the banks and bring about such a condition as would prevent the banks accepting the money. There must be some flexibility about the rate charged. We certainly must have at least 2½ per cent in order to pay the interest and likewise meet the obligations incident to administration. I think the bill taken altogether would clearly indicate to the board that it was the purpose of Congress to have such a rate as would meet engagements under the bill and no greater rate. If we should fix a maximum it would probably have to be fixed too high, and the maximum at 3 per cent, if named, might impel the board to reach the rate of 3 per cent independent of the necessities of the case. But if the rate is fixed at a minimum of 2½ per cent and is made uniform in all the States and Territories, and it appears on the face of the bill itself that it is not a profit-making adventure, but only an addition to the Postal Service, for the accommodation of the people, there certainly could not be such a construction placed upon the whole act and the two amendments—the one pending and the other to be proposed—as would warrant the board in raising the rate of interest to a point where the banks would refuse the money.

Mr. BRISTOW. May I ask that the proposition, which has not been read, may be read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. CARTER. The Senator from Nebraska has the amendment written out, and I will ask him to read it.

Mr. BURKETT. On page 5, line 19, after the words "per annum," the amendment as prepared proposes to insert these words:

Which rate shall be uniform throughout the several States and Territories.

Mr. BRISTOW. Then, with that amendment incorporated, which I understand is acceptable to the committee, there will be a uniform rate of not less than 2½ per cent, which will prevail throughout the Union.

Mr. CARTER. That is the effect of the amendment, and the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me there ought to be some limitation. I grant that the argument of the Senator from Montana is forcible when he states that the board would hardly increase the rate to an amount that would result in the withdrawal of these funds, taking into consideration the phraseology of this bill and the manifest intent of Congress. But, nevertheless, it seems to me there ought to be some provision or declaration in the bill indicating that it is the purpose and desire of Congress that this money shall be left in the banks; and I fear that the last two lines of the amendment of the Senator from Utah throws the field wide open for a withdrawal of these funds, the very thing we have been seeking to avoid here since the discussion began.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana as to the advisability of a declaration in this bill that it is the intention that the board shall simply make a rate that will cover the interest and cost of administration.

Mr. CARTER. I see no objection to that, providing the phraseology is so framed as to leave such reasonable flexibility as may be necessary to avoid hampering administration. For instance, a declaration that it is not the purpose of Congress, by or through this measure, to make any profit for the United States. There might be a profit, and there will at times be a profit to the postal revenues received from the operations of this bill. At other times there may be a corresponding loss.

If the rates were so adjusted in the rigid terms of the law as to prevent the board charging enough interest at any time to meet contingencies, then the board might find itself very greatly hampered, and the law would be rendered inefficient. A declaration that it is not the intention of the United States to make this a profit-yielding measure for the postal revenues or the Treasury would, I take it, construe the bill according to its true intent.

Mr. JONES. I think there should be some declaration of that kind, because I understand that is the policy of the bill. I do not think the board, however, ought to be restricted, so that there might not be any profit in a given year, but it should be so arranged that one year with another there should not be a profit made out of this business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PILES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator from Montana if, at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, there could not be added a phrase something like this:

Which rate shall not be less than 2½ per cent per annum and not more than an amount sufficient to provide amply for the expenses of maintaining this system.

Mr. CARTER. Whether "expenses" would include interest charges I do not know. Probably the interest charge might be considered an expense. I will say to the Senator that the general idea of his amendment is proper enough, according to my view. If it is clear to his mind and the mind of the Senate that the term "expenses" would include the interest to be paid to the depositors at the post-offices—

Mr. BRISTOW. I hardly think that—

Mr. CARTER. "Expense and interest."

Mr. BULKELEY. Would it not be well to insert "expense and interest?"

Mr. CARTER. "Expense and interest." That, I think, would make the matter more clear.

Mr. BRISTOW. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest, however, that the amendment would come in better where the rate of interest is provided—that is, the rate of 2 per cent payable to the depositor in the post-office—better than to have it follow the amendment offered by myself.

Mr. BURKETT. Yesterday when I had the floor the Senate will recall that I suggested the putting in of an amendment in line 19, on page 5. There is the place where it seemed it ought to come in, if we are going to put in such a provision—that is, to insert, after the words "at a rate of interest not less than 2½ per cent per annum," the words "nor more than is reasonably sufficient to meet the expenses of the system herein established."

Mr. SMOOT. That is the proper place, if the amendment is going to be inserted.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah be first disposed of.

Mr. BURKETT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska to offer the amendment he has just suggested.

Mr. BURKETT. After the words "per annum," in line 19, on page 5, I move to insert:

Nor more than is reasonably sufficient to meet the expenses of the system herein established.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest "to meet the expenses of the system and interest charges."

Mr. BURKETT. It seems to me that interest is one of the expenses. I think that is included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send his amendment to the desk, that the Secretary may read it?

Mr. CARTER. While the Senator is preparing the amendment I request unanimous consent that the following table be printed in the Record. It shows the number of postal money-order offices in each State and Territory, separated into presidential and first-class post-offices, in operation July 1, 1909. The number of postal money-order offices has been increasing. January 8, 1910, the number was 51,824. From this table each Senator can determine the number of presidential offices and likewise the number of fourth-class offices in the money-order issuing class, and also the total of both.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana if the table shows the number of money-order offices and the stations from which money orders are issued, but be-

longing to the same general post-office? I understand there are not 51,000 separate and individual offices that are money-order offices, but that figure includes the stations as well as the main offices in the total. Does that appear in the table?

Mr. CARTER. It does not appear in the table. I am not aware of the basis upon which the table was prepared by the department, so I am unable to answer the Senator's question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana that the table be printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table showing the number of postal money-order offices in each State and Territory, separated into Presidential and fourth-class post-offices, in operation July 1, 1909.

State or Territory.	Presidential—first, second, and third classes.	Fourth class.	Total.
Alabama.....	97	991	1,088
Alaska.....	9	29	38
Arizona.....	24	159	183
Arkansas.....	102	1,068	1,169
California.....	228	1,104	1,332
Colorado.....	81	501	582
Connecticut.....	112	260	372
Delaware.....	21	75	96
District of Columbia.....	1		1
Florida.....	62	715	777
Georgia.....	151	925	1,076
Guam.....		1	1
Hawaii.....	10	60	70
Idaho.....	47	337	384
Illinois.....	433	1,294	1,727
Indiana.....	232	923	1,155
Iowa.....	336	940	1,276
Kansas.....	248	806	1,054
Kentucky.....	106	1,429	1,535
Louisiana.....	70	783	853
Maine.....	106	735	841
Maryland.....	55	595	650
Massachusetts.....	193	487	680
Michigan.....	278	1,020	1,298
Minnesota.....	229	845	1,074
Mississippi.....	107	862	969
Missouri.....	242	1,455	1,697
Montana.....	49	328	377
Nebraska.....	183	579	762
Nevada.....	27	123	150
New Hampshire.....	68	357	425
New Jersey.....	169	558	727
New Mexico.....	33	313	346
New York.....	503	2,028	2,531
North Carolina.....	118	1,130	1,248
North Dakota.....	118	497	615
Ohio.....	323	1,477	1,800
Oklahoma.....	166	873	1,039
Oregon.....	76	490	566
Pennsylvania.....	485	2,806	3,290
Porto Rico.....	12	62	74
Rhode Island.....	23	95	118
Samoa.....		1	1
South Carolina.....	75	533	608
South Dakota.....	99	388	487
Tennessee.....	106	852	958
Texas.....	320	1,664	1,984
Utah.....	30	230	260
Vermont.....	59	358	417
Virginia.....	115	1,847	1,962
Washington.....	103	606	709
West Virginia.....	86	1,195	1,281
Wisconsin.....	250	828	1,078
Wyoming.....	26	199	225
Grand total.....	7,202	38,806	46,007

* The number of postal money-order offices is increasing. On January 8, 1910, there were 51,824.

Mr. BURKETT. I now offer the amendment I suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 19, after the words "per annum," insert the following:

Nor more than is reasonably sufficient to meet the expenses and interest charges of the system herein established, and which rate shall be uniform throughout the several States and Territories.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the word "is" be stricken out and the words "may be" inserted, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKETT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska modifies his amendment by striking out "is" and inserting "may be." The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, before I vote on the amendment I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether

he has taken into account the possible contingency of losses by failures of banks in which these deposits are made. It seems to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, to wit, a declaration that it is not the purpose of this act to make it a matter of profit to the Post-Office Department or to the Government is quite as good as this amendment. While I do not want to object to the amendment, I should like before I vote on it to know what the Senator from Nebraska will say about it.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Vermont very frankly that the first part of the amendment as I have now drawn it is very questionable in my mind. I really have some apprehensions with reference to our adopting it. It was suggested to me yesterday in practically this form by the discussion which was precipitated on the amendment of the Senator from Utah, which has just been adopted. Then, resulting from the discussion this morning, I joined it with the other provision making the rate uniform. I rather doubt whether we ought to throw about the department any limitations as to the maximum, but we should leave that rather to the conditions of commerce and trade. I rather doubt whether it would not be well if there comes a time when the United States can serve itself with this money, both from the income standpoint and the standpoint of taking care of some of its own bonds, perhaps, that it should be able to do it. However, it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that this sort of an amendment should go in, and that there should be that limitation, and I am not greatly averse to it.

In reply specifically to the question the Senator from Vermont has asked, I think there are more words even in this amendment as I offered it than it is necessary to include. I think the words "expenses" alone would have included not only the 2 per cent that is going to be paid to the individual for his deposit in the post-office, but that it would have included the running expenses, the going expenses of the postal system, and it would have included as a part of the going expenses whatever may be lost here and there in the banks.

When the department takes up the question of rates, one of the questions they will have to consider will be, first, what are the ordinary expenses going to be for the additional clerical help, the blanks, the printing, and all those things? Then they will have to make a calculation as to what the probable loss may be, and they will have to calculate that. They will have to add enough to the 2 per cent to cover all the expenses of the system. The word "expenses," in my judgment, would cover the 2 per cent interest that is to be paid. That is a part of the expenses of the system. It would cover whatever loss there may be in the banks, for that is certainly a part of the system. It would cover the running, clerical expenses of the system, and that sort of thing, and by using that word alone we would not tie up the department in the way I suggested.

If we would strike out the words "and interest," in my judgment it would be abundantly provided for. I am not certain, I will say, but that we sometimes put in too many words. I have even more doubt of its covering the exact point the Senator has suggested after putting in the words "and interest" than if you left in simply the word "expenses." When you go to specifying and detailing what the provision is going to mean there may something come in that is not covered. The word "expenses," by any reasonable interpretation, would include every item of expense, loss, clerical help, interest, and all.

As I said, I would rather risk it with just the word "expenses" than to add even the words "and interest;" but it seemed to be wise to add those words. I wanted to get the amendment in a form that would be acceptable; and I thought there would be plenty of time to think over it after we got it in print, and therefore I accepted it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, day before yesterday I offered an amendment to section 8 in the way of a substitute for it. It was really the pending amendment yesterday, but the Senate by common consent considered the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], that has just been disposed of. In order to make the record entirely clear, I withdraw, with the consent of the Senate, the substitute which I offered day before yesterday, and propose the following amendment to section 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn and the substitute therefor will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "banks," in section 8, page 5, line 15, down to and including the word "surplus," in line 21, and to insert:

Whether organized under national or state law, being subject to national or state supervision and examination and doing business in the city, town, or village in which the post-office is situated, at a rate of interest not less than 2½ per cent per annum if there is more than one such bank in any city, town, or village willing to take such deposit upon the terms provided for herein, the same shall be divided among them substantially according to their capital and surplus. If no one of such banks in any such city, town, or village is willing to accept the deposits upon such terms, or if there be no bank or banks therein, or if the post-office at which the funds are received is not in a city, town, or village, then the deposit shall be made in a solvent bank or banks subject to such supervision and examination of the State or Territory in which the post-office is situated, giving preference to those that are in the same general community as the post-office receiving the funds.

Also strike out from and including the word "Provided," in line 18, on page 6, to and including the word "depositories," in lines 22 and 23.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, this amendment, or these amendments, are in substance and, it may be said, in words precisely like the substitute that I offered for the entire section, the only difference being that I have adopted the language of the original section in so far as it was possible to do it and preserve the changes that I intended to make. These amendments have been considered, I believe, by the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 5436) to create a legislative council in the district of Alaska, to confer legislative powers thereon, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside without prejudice. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. CUMMINS. These amendments make two changes in the section. First, they render it more certain that the money coming at the post-office of a particular city, town, or village shall be deposited in the bank or banks of that city, town, or village, and if there be no such bank or banks there, then in the neighborhood or in the general community. I believe it to be in exact harmony with the spirit of the bill as reported. I understand the Senator in charge of the bill has no objection to the adoption of this amendment.

The second change is to eliminate from the section the provision which requires 10 per cent of the entire deposits throughout the United States to be kept in the Treasury of the United States or in some bank as a reserve fund.

Mr. CARTER. I will ask the Senator if he will not substitute the word "permitted" for "required," merely permitting the board to keep this reserve in the banks or in the Treasury not exceeding 10 per cent?

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not quite catch the suggestion.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator stated that the reserve referred to in the proviso is required to be kept in the Treasury at Washington.

Mr. CUMMINS. Or in the banks.

Mr. CARTER. Or in the banks. The bill merely permits it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will correct my reference to the bill to that extent. The language of the bill is that the board shall be permitted to do so if it sees fit; but those four lines are stricken out in this amendment. I understand the Senator in charge of the bill has no objection to that change.

The amendments made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] I find are contained in that part of section 8 which I seek to strike out, but I am sure there will be found a way in which the text of my amendment can be amended or a way in which the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska can be preserved even though the text be changed as I have suggested.

Mr. BURKETT. I think, as I have listened to the reading of the amendment, that if it shall be adopted I can insert my amendment after the provision for the minimum rate of interest. I will want to do that after the amendment has been voted on, if it shall be adopted.

Mr. CARTER. It was intended to make the text of the bill on page 5 in the particulars referred to quite sufficient to accomplish the purpose manifest on the face of the text. I have no objection to any language which will make that purpose more definite if it is at all questionable. I doubt if this amendment does make the text more clear, but the Senator

from Iowa, after mature consideration, thinks it more specific and that it will accomplish the purpose with greater certainty. I therefore accept the amendment, adding, of course, the insertion therein of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I presume by unanimous consent the amendment which was heretofore adopted in that portion of the text can be inserted in this amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. Then, I ask to perfect the amendment in line 7 by inserting after the words "per annum" the words of the amendment which I offered and which was adopted a moment ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. I accept that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the insertion requested by the Senator from Nebraska will be made. The question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Now, the question is on the other amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has also offered another amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. In section 8, on page 6, strike out from and including the word "Provided," in line 18, down to and including the word "depositories," in lines 22 and 23.

Mr. CARTER. In view of the other amendments adopted that amendment is eminently appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before it is voted on, let me inquire whether there is any other provision which requires a reserve.

Mr. CARTER. There is. The entire deposit in the banks is subject to check at all times, and constitutes a reserve for immediate use.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is all right, then.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I gave notice at the time I proposed the amendments just adopted that I would offer an amendment to section 7, which I now do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In section 7, on page 5, line 7, after the word "prescribe," insert:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State in which the depositor withdrawing resides, and, so far as practicable, from the deposits in the community in which the depositor resides.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it will be granted on every side that this amendment is necessary in order to carry out the spirit and effectuate the purpose of the amendments already adopted.

Mr. CARTER. I will ask that the amendment be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the amendment.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that the language might be simplified, if I may be permitted to have the amendment a moment. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that it should read:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State, and, so far as practicable, from the deposits in the community in which the depositor resides.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests, without any change in the meaning, that the language might be shortened by putting it in this way:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State, and, so far as practicable, from the deposits in the community in which the depositor withdrawing resides.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me ask a question which occurs to me. I am not so familiar as I might be with all the provisions of the amendments the Senator from Iowa offered, but it seems to me we are liable to get this tied up so that we can not do any business under it in our anxiety to do what we all want to do, of course, and that is to keep the money in the State where it comes from. Take the amendment now before us for an example. Suppose there is not any money in the banks of a State—I take an extreme case—where the banks have not accepted the money. Then, as to the money which under the provisions of the bill is invested somewhere else, how will you pay those withdrawals?

Mr. GALLINGER. There will be no withdrawals nor any money.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator mean, if the moneys that have been gathered at the post-offices have not been deposited in that State and have gone elsewhere?

Mr. BURKETT. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. The possibility is so remote that I think it is hardly necessary to provide for it.

Mr. BURKETT. I said I used the most extreme case, of course, but there might be all grades of it. You may get into trouble if you just provide for a certain place for withdrawals

to be paid from. I can not see any great danger myself in rather leaving that to the board. I understand, of course, that the object is to keep the money in the local banks among the people where it originates, and in that I coincide; but it seems to me that unless there is some saving clause somewhere, this provision might make trouble. As I said, I am not familiar enough with the provisions of the other amendments submitted by the Senator from Iowa to know just what this amendment might result in.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am sure that the contingency to which the Senator from Nebraska refers would never occur. If the Senator believes that it is so imminent that it ought to be provided for, I hope he will suggest an amendment in some appropriate part of the bill. This particular amendment is eminently right, because we all agree that we do not want the money which has been deposited in the banks in New England withdrawn for the purpose of paying the depositors in Iowa or in Utah; and, therefore, we ought to fix this in any event as we desire to have it, and make some other provision for the contingency feared by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GALLINGER. At this point I am going to suggest, and I think the Senator having the bill in charge will agree with me that it is well to do so, that at the conclusion of to-day's session the bill shall be reprinted with the amendments which have been agreed to, so that we will have it before us to-morrow.

Mr. CUMMINS. With the amendments in italics?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; with the amendments in italics, so that we will have it before us to-morrow in a shape in which we can understand it. Several amendments have been agreed to that I confess I have not carefully examined. Then, if it be found that we have made mistakes, we can correct them either before the bill goes into the Senate or after it reaches the Senate.

Mr. CARTER. The suggestion is so clearly appropriate, I now ask, fearing the matter might hereafter be overlooked, that at the close of the consideration of the bill for this legislative day the bill be reprinted with all amendments adopted in italics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am quite willing to adopt the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, and I ask that the amendment I have offered be made to read as follows:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State, and, so far as practicable, from the deposits in the community in which the depositor withdrawing resides.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President, I can not help doubting the wisdom of that amendment. We know the experience of our public officers. I think they have been very careful in times past to withdraw funds from public depositories, even without any law regulating it, very equally and proportionately over the country. The Senator suggested that the proposition I made was the suggestion of a very remote danger, but I undertake to say that there will be some of the States in which the banks will not want to take money from the Government at the rate of interest at which it is going to be placed, which can not be less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It probably will not be less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ or $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. It is going to be uniform. That may be a small rate of interest in Iowa, Nebraska, Idaho, and other Western States, but it is a pretty high rate of interest in the Eastern States. I surmise that the time may come when it will be too high in some States, and the banks will refuse to pay that interest. They will not want the money. Under the provision which is in the bill, if that time does come, I want to know where you are going to get the money to pay the depositors. You have tied it up. I can not see any good reason for it. All through the bill we have put every safeguard against the centralization of this money or its being withdrawn unduly from any particular locality. There would not be any government official, after reading this law, who would be able to satisfy his conscience as a public official and not keep these funds as near by as he possibly could in the community where they are collected. It seems to me that this provision would tie it up so tight that the machinery might not work.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BURKETT. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not think this would remedy that sort of evil: Where this amendment provides that "withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State" to add the words "if there are sufficient deposits in said State?"

Mr. BURKETT. Of course something of that sort could be inserted, but it seems to me that the suggestion of the neces-

sity for that only accentuates the difficulty in which we may find ourselves. I do not think the danger is sufficient to warrant us in adding this limitation or this restriction. It does not seem to me that the danger is probable enough that any public official, after this bill is written as it is, is going up into the banks in Vermont or out in Iowa to draw money to pay to depositors over in Nebraska or Oklahoma or elsewhere. I think we had better err on the side of keeping the machinery so that it will run practically than to restrict it so that we will get into the trouble we are likely to get into with that provision, in my judgment.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am somewhat in accord with the views just enunciated by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT]. I am afraid, if we undertake to go into all the details of this bill, that the Treasurer of the United States and the officials in charge will say that the men who framed this bill knew as much about practical banking as Nicodemus is said to have known about the second birth. I believe the better way is to set forth the principles that actuate this body, if they can be set forth in some way that embraces all of the thoughts and ideas which have been enunciated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]; to say that it is the purpose of this legislation that the money received on deposit in any State or community shall be deposited in the banks there, and leave the details so that they will work out easily and practically.

Now, let me make a suggestion which illustrates what I mean. I shall not be surprised if it would be found when we come to the practical workings of this bill, that it would be better that in the State of Iowa, for instance, there should be some central bank, perhaps at Des Moines, where this money would be deposited in little dribbles by the postmaster; that it then be subdivided into even dollars, in round amounts, among the different banks of the State, so as to avoid this complex figuring of accounts—a half dollar, a dollar, or \$5 at a time between the department and the little banks. I do not know that it is so, but I believe the whole spirit of this matter can be worked out in a way that will absolutely meet the ideas of the Senator from Iowa. I have no doubt that the men in charge of this matter—the trustees who will be appointed—will follow the spirit of whatever we adopt here in the execution of this law. I may be wrong; but I wish it might be the policy of Senators on this bill to leave the little details to the men who have the practical knowledge of how these matters should be worked out, assuring the Senator from Iowa, as I do, that I believe they all will work out exactly to his liking.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if I looked upon this as a detail I should certainly yield to the assurances of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE]. With me it is a fundamental, vital part of the measure. I can not for a moment think that the board that is created here would be animated by any other than upright and honest purpose; but we have had enough experience in our country with money that is subject to be placed here or there, at the pleasure of a government official, to be somewhat wary of committing this sort of discretion to any board. It has not been very long since one part of this country, with a great deal of unity of action, went to the Secretary of the Treasury and insisted that the money of the United States which was distributed all over the United States should be withdrawn from certain parts and concentrated in another part.

The Secretary of the Treasury had no other purpose than to do the thing which he believed would benefit the whole country. I do not want, however, a bill passed that in a time of stress and storm would enable this board, even if it believed it to be wisest for the country, to take money, which had been deposited in Iowa, and to remove it to New York by the payment of the depositors in New York, who were withdrawing, simply because the board thought that the business of the country and the necessities of the country required that New York should have the money or required that the money should not be drawn from the New York banks.

It involves a feature of the system which, as I think, is of vast importance; and I am not willing to allow that contingency to go unprovided for. I am perfectly willing to see inserted anywhere in the bill that if there is no money in the banks of the State in which the withdrawals are occurring, then the money may be taken from the banks of other States, although I regard that possibility as so remote that it need not give us the slightest concern.

The real point, however, is—and I shall feel compelled to insist upon it—that the withdrawals in any State or Territory shall be paid through the deposits or by deposits in the banks in that State or Territory. We can in that way preserve the purpose of the bill; there will be no danger attending it; and I can not conceive that it will in anywise restrict or hamper the board in the administration of the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am somewhat at a loss to know just how you are going to compel the banks to keep the money in any particular place, inasmuch as you, by another provision of the bill, give them the right to use it as though it were their own.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I assume that is a question directed to me.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. And I shall be very glad to answer it.

Of course, the moment the Government deposits this money—derived from the post-offices, if you please—in the banks, it ceases to be the Government's money. The Government simply becomes a creditor of the bank in which the deposit is made, and the bank can do whatsoever it pleases within the limits of its power with that money, just as it could do with the money deposited by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN].

It is assumed, however, that the banks will always keep themselves in condition to satisfy the demands of any depositor, whether it be the Government of the United States or whether it be the Senator from Idaho. This has no concern with the use of the money by the bank. It only declares—if I may be permitted to explain it, for the Senator from Idaho was not here when I came in—it only means that, if during the last month the savings depositors in Iowa were to call on the Government for a million dollars for the payment of their deposits, the Government would check or call upon the banks of Iowa in which it had deposits for that sum, and would not call upon the banks of New York or the banks of New England for that sum. That is the whole purpose and the entire scope of the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then, Mr. President, it follows, of course, that those banks must at all times carry a reserve far in excess of that which they carry under ordinary banking transactions.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, on the contrary, if I were a banker, I should consider the deposits made by the Government—the postal savings fund—as much more likely to be permanent than the deposits of individual customers of the bank, because the experience of other countries has been that such deposits grow constantly for a great many years anyway after the institution of the system. While I believe it to be true that the law, so far as national banks are concerned, would require them to keep the same reserve for government deposits that they keep for all other deposits, yet these reserves would be much less likely to be called upon in the case of the Government than in the case of the individual depositor.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then, Mr. President, I understand that it is not contemplated that any reserve whatever shall be carried by the banks because of these deposits.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that is an error so far as the national banks are concerned, because the law applicable to the creation of reserves would be just as applicable to the government deposits as to any other deposits, and, of course, if a bank had a million dollars of government deposits, its reserve would necessarily be much larger than though it had not those government deposits.

Mr. SMOOT. The same thing applies to state banks, but that is because, under the law of the State, they are compelled to keep a certain reserve.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely, if the state law requires them to keep a reserve.

Mr. HEYBURN. Unless some action has been taken during my absence from the Chamber, there is no provision that would cover this class of deposits—I mean no provision governing government deposits which would be applicable. These moneys are not declared to be public moneys, and so they go into the banks as private deposits unless some action has been taken since yesterday and during my absence, because when we were discussing this question yesterday it was conceded that these moneys were not declared to be public moneys.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, as I understand—and I am sure I am right about it—the law which requires national banks to maintain a reserve applies to all deposits, no matter whether individual or government deposits. This does not affect that law at all.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HEYBURN. I do.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, if I recollect the law in regard to government deposits, where the banks are required to furnish collateral, as they are required to do now, they are not required to keep any reserve.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is the answer to the proposition?

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; but this bill gives the bank the opportunity either to give indemnifying security or collateral.

If the bank chooses to give collateral, then it would be precisely like any other deposit.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, as I understand the propositions in this bill they practically place these deposits on the same level with ordinary government deposits. The banks are required either to give an indemnity bond or collateral for the postal savings-bank deposits, the same as for ordinary deposits of the Government, and the Senator from Iowa will realize that practically none of these funds will remain in the communities where they will be deposited in the postal savings banks. They will drift, with all the other funds of the banks of the West or the banks of the East, to the commercial centers of the country, where they will be used as they are used now. It is going to be a difficult task sometimes, it seems to me, for the board of trustees, if they are restricted to keeping deposits in every little bank in the country, to withdraw from those banks enough funds to meet the drafts in a particular place.

It occurs to me that it is not wise to tie up the details of administration in this legislation authorizing a postal savings-bank system. We must leave some of the details, even as we have done, to some board to provide some measure for the withdrawal of deposits.

It sometimes happens in this country that we have a dearth of currency in one section and not in another. It might be possible that in the good State of Iowa, with which my financial dealings have made me quite familiar, sometimes they have a dearth of currency with which the banks could meet drafts of this character, which might be made with but a moment's warning. We have had the same conditions in the East. So it seems to me we should leave some of these questions of administration to the discretion of the board. The Government is responsible for the funds that come into its hands, whether they are called public funds or funds of whatever character they may be. They are deposited with the Government, and the gentlemen who are named in this bill to act as trustees are merely carrying out a governmental policy. They are in charge of the fund, not as we have it in some departments of the Government, I am sorry to say, for we have now in the hands of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and subject actually to the control of the distinguished military officer in charge of that department of the Government, and on deposit in the trust companies of New York almost exclusively, more than \$12,000,000. You will find some allusion to it in the report of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. He requires collateral, but it is subject to the fluctuations of the market; and the vaults that contain those securities are opened day by day; and as they are disposed of by the banks that hold deposits other securities are substituted in their place as the market rises and falls.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I was attempting to develop the position. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BULKELEY] first observed it, but has drifted off into a wider question. I want to present this question in a concrete form. As I understand the law, the banks are not required to carry any reserves against secured funds now.

Mr. BULKELEY. I think the Senator is absolutely right on that question.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes. The idea I started to develop was, that these funds were of such a character that the bank would not be required to carry any reserve to meet the drafts upon it, so that whatever reserves were held to meet these drafts would be the reserves that are held against another class of deposits. That would naturally follow. Suppose the Government has a million dollars of this class of funds in a bank, and ordinary depositories have another million dollars; the million dollars the Government has is secured under the provisions of this act by the deposit of collateral or such other security as is provided for. The other deposits are not secured at all, except by the reserve that the bank is required to carry. Here is a bank with two classes of funds, one of which carries a reserve and the other of which does not, and yet they may be drawn out under exactly similar circumstances.

Mr. President, I have before me this provision of the bill that is pertinent to be considered in connection with that thought. It will be observed that the amendment introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], which, I understand, was adopted during my absence to-day, provides that the Government may not withdraw this money from the banks so long as the banks are willing to retain it and pay interest for it. We give the banks the right to pay this money back or else stop the payment of interest, and we reserve no corresponding right to the Government. The Government can not withdraw it from the banks, except for limited purposes, and the Senator in charge of this bill, if I understood him correctly, has

prophesied that the fund would never diminish, but that it would be a growing fund at least for some years.

The result is that if the bank serves notice upon the Government that it will no longer pay interest, it is no longer required to pay it, because the Government, though required to receive interest, can not withdraw it from the bank except for the contingency which the Senator in charge of the bill says will never arise. That is rather an anomalous condition of affairs. The Government can not withdraw it and thus save itself from paying interest under any condition that is likely to arise, but the bank at any time, according to the letter and the text of this amendment, which has been adopted, may relieve itself of the obligation of paying interest by serving notice upon the Government to take its money out.

Is that a businesslike transaction, where one side disarms itself from the right to recover its money and the other side is equipped with a weapon by which it may stop interest payment at any time? It does not seem to me that it is. I think something has been overlooked there. Take a bank, for instance, that has \$100,000 on deposit, and, because of the financial conditions of the country, that bank knows, or thinks it knows, that the Government can find no other market for that money. It simply notifies them that after the day after to-morrow they desire that the money be drawn out, otherwise the interest will stop on it. What provision is there for that?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Government received notice from the bank to withdraw the money or, in other words, that they would not comply with the terms of this bill, then the board of trustees is authorized to withdraw that money from the bank and invest it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Invest it in government bonds. The rate that the Government pays is only 2 per cent, and we have no government bonds drawing less than 2 per cent. I have no doubt that the Government to-day could, if it were a question of profit, make money upon the action of a bank that would take that position.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is rather a startling proposition. Government bonds in very large amounts are about as difficult to get sometimes as some other things.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill does not provide that it shall be confined to government bonds.

Mr. HEYBURN. No.

Mr. SMOOT. There are other securities that can be purchased.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes. Well, Mr. President, if you wanted to inflate the price of securities, all you would have to do would be to put the Government in the market as a buyer, and as a buyer under compulsion, as a buyer that must find a market for its money on the best terms possible, with a limitation as to the rate of interest to be paid.

I do not believe that any Senator or any number of Senators, after a reasonable consideration of that question, would advise a policy that would result in the placing of the Government in that position.

These will be large sums; they will not be petty and trifling sums; they will be counted by millions; and if the Government, pursuant to a notice from a bank that it will no longer pay interest, should withdraw a million dollars and go into the market with the avowed intention of buying the limited class of securities provided for in this bill, what would be the effect on the market price of those securities?

Mr. SMOOT. There would hardly be a million dollars in one bank.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, multiply your millions, for there will be hundreds of millions. I am only using it as a unit of consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Not in one bank; and that is what we are talking about.

Mr. HEYBURN. I know. You might just as well talk about the complexion of the cashier of the bank as to attempt to divide a great principle by any such lines as that. The bank, so far as the deposit is concerned, is a unit, because the principle is a unit in its application to the sum total of deposits.

Mr. SMOOT. But that is no reason why all the banks in the country would act as a unit.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, Mr. President, it is not the policy of wise legislation to provide for conditions that might become dangerous. In conservative legislation we legislate only along lines that preclude the possibility of danger. If we are going to

pass a law which, in the event of certain conditions, would be destructive of the interests of the people, we are on pretty reckless ground.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me suggest to the Senator from Idaho that, upon inquiry, I find that 5,069 national and state banks in the United States pay no interest at all on deposits.

Mr. HEYBURN. I know that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This morning I was told at the Riggs Bank that they do not pay any interest on \$7,000,000 of deposits. I think we may very appropriately consider what the alternative of the Government may be with a large fund in the event that it may not be needed by the banks.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is a very wise suggestion. I have been diligently inquiring for some weeks, or ever since this bill has been under consideration, as to the character and proportion of national banks that pay interest on deposits. I find that a very large majority of them do not, and I very seriously doubt the right of any of them to pay interest on deposits.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I think every bank in the United States, including the Riggs Bank, in the city of Washington, pays interest to other banks on daily balances.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is another proposition.

Mr. CARTER. And on time deposits, also.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was not speaking with reference to the reserve. I asked the question whether they paid interest on deposits. They did not pay interest.

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly.

Mr. CUMMINS. What is the aggregate of all the deposits in the bank?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not know; but I think there are in the neighborhood of seven or eight thousand national banks in the country, are there not? This shows that more than a majority of them—

Mr. BULKELEY. Probably twice that number.

Mr. CARTER. There are about 22,000 banks in all. I can tell the Senator in a moment the number of national banks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Here are 5,000 banks that do not pay any interest.

Mr. CUMMINS. On individual deposits.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Michigan must certainly confine that statement to individual deposits. I doubt very much whether there are many national banks in this country that do not pay interest to other banks which deposit their money with them.

Mr. HEYBURN. Why would a bank—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would not dispute—

Mr. HEYBURN. Why would a bank bid for the deposits of the postal savings banks and pay for the use of the money when they can get all the money they want without paying interest? The conclusion is inevitable that the high class of banks that have sufficient money on hand for the transaction of all the business they can get would not be the ones which would receive it, and that the ones which would receive this money and be anxious for it are the class of banks having difficulty in getting credit.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to that I may say that the strongest banks in the city of New York are to-day paying interest on deposits from western banks, and they have done so for years and years.

Mr. HEYBURN. For what purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. For the purpose of securing the deposits, and just exactly for the same purpose that they would pay interest under this bill—to secure the deposits from the Government.

Mr. HEYBURN. There is the Senegambian, Mr. President, right there. The New York banks that pay high rates of interest for money to use on call would probably get all of it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is impossible—

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand the Senator's proposition exactly. If we are to stand here and legislate a system of government by which the money is to start on its course from every home and hamlet and business center in the United States toward the city of New York, I take it you will find no support for the measure outside of the city of New York and the sympathies that surround it.

Mr. President, that is just what would happen; and because of just such provisions as are obtained in this amendment, adopted this morning, by which the Government's hands are tied and not the banks'. The banks have the money when these conditions arise. They must have it before they arise. They have it, and the Government can only draw it under

limited circumstances. That is the provision of this amendment. So unless they want to withdraw it for depositors they can not get it out of the bank at all.

Let us see if I am right about that. Here is the language of it. It is most astonishing:

That money deposited in the banks and secured to the satisfaction of the board of trustees, as herein provided, shall only be withdrawn to pay the depositors and other obligations of the Government under this act.

I suppose that means the expense of administering it.

It shall only be withdrawn for that purpose. It can not be withdrawn for the purpose of depositing it somewhere else. The Government can not withdraw it for the purpose of moving it from one money center to another. It can not withdraw it for the expenses of government. There is the situation as to the Government's relation to the money. It—shall not be withdrawn for investment so long as the banks are willing to retain it and pay the rate of interest prescribed.

Investment. That refers to the bond investment. They can not withdraw it at all for transfer. The Government can not, but the banks which are made the custodians of the money may send it down the stream that ends at Castle Garden. Is that a wise provision of law, think you? Do you think the Government's interests are protected; do you think the depositors' interests are protected under a provision like that?

Mr. CUMMINS. Is the Senator from Idaho in favor of putting into this bill a provision that will determine how the banks shall use this money after it is deposited with them?

Mr. HEYBURN. No. If I put any provision into this bill, I would favor putting in a provision of safety; and as far as I would go would be that the Government should receive the money through its agencies in the post-offices and take it into its own custody and use it for its own purposes, if it paid interest on it, and hold it as a sacred fund to be invested in property and in things over which the Government had absolute control. That is as far as I would go. I will never be a party to legislation that contemplates the picking up of this class of money and putting it into the channels of speculation. I never would be a party to that. I never would be a party to making it the plaything for what are called "financiers."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I may be permitted to make a suggestion to the Senator from Idaho, I will venture the assertion that the reserves in the national banks in the city of New York encourage speculation.

Mr. HEYBURN. There are two classes of reserves in the New York banks. There are the reserves that are held against the daily or recurring drafts of the bank that does business with the New York bank; what they call the correspondent bank. That is one class of reserves. Then there is the other class of reserves, which we discovered here a few months ago when we were discussing the last financial bill—the reserves which the outside banks send to New York, upon which they receive interest, which may be used by the New York banks for any purpose that occurs to them. Those are the two classes of reserves. I was not referring to the class of reserves carried against the daily balances of exchange.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Right on that point, I was reading this morning an article in which it was stated that on the 28th of April, 1909, the items "due to other national banks" from the banks of New York, Chicago, and St. Louis footed up in round numbers to \$546,000,000.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; it has increased over \$100,000,000 since we discussed the question last. Then it was about four hundred and a small fraction millions. It is evidently growing. It is evident that the outside banks are carrying larger reserves in the New York banks than then, and that the money of the country is concentrating in New York; and when it goes out of there it is at the will of the New York banks. I am not going into a general discussion of the financial system of balances, but it is written in this amendment to the extent that it requires the consideration I have given to it, in my judgment.

I should like to know what steps will be taken by the Government or by this board upon notice from a bank that they would not pay any interest. There is no time limit. So they might say that after to-morrow we will not pay any interest on the deposits held by us of this class of funds.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator yield for an answer at this time?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CARTER. The proposition of the Senator is that arrangements are being made to require that the money deposited in a neighborhood shall be retained in the neighborhood, and that, therefore, we are making arrangements to sluice it into the banks in New York. That is, as I understand, the Senator's

first proposition. I will undertake in the course of a few moments, when the Senator yields the floor, to touch upon that aspect of this bill as covered by the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator gathers no wisdom as to my position between now and the time when he takes the floor in reply to it, he will be firing in the air. I have assumed no such position. I was considering not that the credits might stay in the neighborhood, but that the money might stay in the neighborhood. There is a vast difference between the question as to whether or not the credits on the books of a bank show that the money is in the bank and the question whether the money is in the bank or not.

Mr. CARTER. To give an illustration, we will assume that a given bank in the city of Boise, in the State of Idaho, declines to pay interest any further on postal savings funds and so notifies the authorities in charge. Thereupon, under the operation of this bill, the board may deposit that money in any other bank in Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. With the consent of the other bank.

Mr. CARTER. Of the other bank.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. The banks of Idaho may become so opulent that they will not require 2 per cent money—

Mr. HEYBURN. They would not take it to-day.

Mr. CARTER. But that day is somewhat distant, I anticipate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Just a moment here.

Mr. CARTER. Failing to get another bank in the State willing to take the discarded deposits—and that failure would not be encountered often—then the bonds referred to in the act may be invested in.

Mr. HEYBURN. May be what?

Mr. CARTER. May become the subject of investment. The money need not lie idle.

Mr. HEYBURN. The most violent assumption I have heard indulged in lately is the one just stated by the Senator. The banks in Idaho would not under existing conditions take a cent of this money. The Senator can just mark that down as a fact.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. HEYBURN. They have all the money they can make use of and are complaining that there are not enough uses to absorb the money they have.

Mr. CARTER. That is a happy state of affairs.

Mr. HEYBURN. It exists in Idaho, and there are a great many other happy states of affairs in that State.

Mr. CARTER. I know—delightful fruit, fine men, and beautiful women. This happy situation is enviable, but I do not envy Idaho. I am glad of her prosperity. It is unique and really unparalleled in the history of any State in this Union.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is very gratifying, and these encomiums are delightful to the ears of those from Idaho.

It is easy enough to build up a theory based upon loaning this money to some other person, but it requires the cooperation of both parties. When the Government of the United States, accumulating as it might in Idaho a fund of a million dollars or so, goes to the banks there and says, "We want you to take this money into your vaults, and we want you to give security for it, which you do not give for ordinary deposits, and security we approve, and we want you to pay interest on it," it would meet with a dead silence on the part of those banks.

Mr. President, this security question is not very well developed—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment right here?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It seems to me that the dangerous feature of this bill, if it has any danger at all in it, grows out of the fact that the Government in the first instance pays interest on these deposits.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is the first evil in it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and next that because of the fact that it pays interest it must loan this money or invest it for the depositor. I want to ask the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Montana, if 5,000 national banks or state banks in the country, with deposits aggregating many hundreds of millions of dollars, do not pay any interest to secure deposits—

Mr. HEYBURN. Or give any bond.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (continuing). Or give any bond, why should the Government engage in the banking business, pay interest, and then have the responsibility for these investments

and practically go into partnership with the banks of the country?

Then one word further. I do not object to the saving individual receiving a return, but he can get that return in any commercial or industrial walk. He may get it in a building and loan association. He may get it from his state bank. But it is the overtimid man who wants his money back on the instant and who wants to take no chances at all who would use this system.

I do not remember whether it was the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Kansas, but I think, on reflection, it was the Senator from Kansas who told me the other day that he knew of one individual who bought \$3,500 worth of post-office money orders and held them because he knew they were secure and he could get his money when he wanted it. If this Government desires to protect the timid and the helpless and hold their funds securely for them, let the Government hold those funds. That is a proper function. I would not object to it. There is nothing paternalistic in it. But when the Government undertakes to invest that fund for innumerable private citizens, I think there is great danger in it and that the Government, for some bad investment or bad policy which perhaps might result disastrously to millions of depositors, would be very seriously criticised and blamed and the foundations of our Government shaken because of this attempt to do business for private individuals.

Mr. HEYBURN. And, Mr. President—

Mr. BULKELEY and Mr. CARTER addressed the Chair.

Mr. HEYBURN. Just a moment. And, Mr. President, after a short time there would be an interminable squabble between the Government and the other creditors of failing institutions as to the right of preference, because no preference is given, and the Government of the United States in five years would have a thousand lawsuits on hand to determine whether or not they should be first considered or how the fund should be administered in the case of a bankrupt or failing estate. Oh, there is a nice prospect of confusion wrapped up in the folds of this bill!

I yield to the Senator from Connecticut temporarily.

Mr. BULKELEY. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan if he does not understand that under the provisions of this bill, whatever may be the result of the investment of deposits, the Government is responsible to the individual depositor, not depending on the success of the investment?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BULKELEY. So that, except to the Government of the United States, it makes no difference whatever.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes. But if the Senator from Connecticut will pardon me, my criticism lies in the fact that we originally undertake to pay interest.

Mr. BULKELEY. I think, if the Senator will permit me, that the iniquity of this whole bill, if there is any iniquity in it, is in the fact that you are establishing by law a demand on the banks of this country to pay interest on their deposits subject to withdrawal from day to day. I think that is the wrong principle of the law, if there is any—this attempt to establish a postal savings bank for the country and to demand that the funds shall be placed in the banks of the various localities, and that they shall pay interest, which is the most dangerous thing, I think, for a bank to engage in.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not object to the Government taking in this money at the post-offices and holding it for the people and repaying it through the post-offices, but in such a case the Government should segregate this money. It need not enter into our revenues. It need not become a part of our fiscal system. We simply hold it in trust for our citizens, and there will be millions of men who will deposit hundreds of millions of dollars to their credit under such circumstances.

Mr. CARTER. Would the Senator have all the collections made at the post-offices consigned to perpetual idleness and permanently withdrawn from the channels of trade?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I think that would be very dangerous, but I would not obligate the Government to loan it through the banks, thus exposing the Government to criticism and doubt.

Mr. CARTER. How could you dispose of this money if you did not loan it or invest it or otherwise handle it?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would get the money back into activity through the medium of the individual citizen who makes his own investment in his own way, rather than to leave it to the initiative of the Government. I would make it of so little advantage to him to carry his money in idleness in the Government's hands that he would invest it in some enterprise in his own community.

Mr. CARTER. We now have, as I understand, a great many million dollars invested in post-office orders, payable to the

purchasers and renewed annually at a cost of \$3 per thousand. One engineer, I was informed recently, working on a dredge on the Panama Canal, had something in excess of \$5,000 in money orders, which he had been regularly renewing each year, refusing to put the money in bank. The money was idle in the post-office or in the hands of the department. The Government could not touch it or use it. The individual not only lost the interest, but likewise suffered the penalty of an annual payment of \$3 per thousand. If this money should be held by the Government without investment—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I did not say without investment.

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly; but we are endeavoring to devise means for its investment that will not disturb the financial equilibrium of the neighborhood and of the country. We require that it shall be deposited in the banks as near as may be at the point of reception; that it shall be deposited there with security, and that the board of trustees shall not be at liberty to take the money deposited in the State of Oregon and at will transfer it to the city of New York, nor to take the money deposited in South Carolina and send it for use in the State of Maine.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; but may the banks do it?

Mr. CUMMINS. The banks do it now.

Mr. CARTER. I suppose the banks in the West, as heretofore, when a surplus of money appears which can not be used at home, will send it where it will bring the best rate of interest.

Mr. HEYBURN. Why should not the Government do it? Why delegate the power to the banks to do it?

Mr. CARTER. I think with the Senator that this juggling of public funds throughout the country is an evil that ought to be guarded against. The Government is a water-logged institution in the banking world, helpless in the matter of self-protection, and used at certain times for the purpose of bracing banks in centers here and there, with questionable wisdom and sometimes with questionable propriety.

Mr. HEYBURN. I concur very largely in that sentiment, and therefore wonder at the attempt to put the Government into the banking business. If I were going to put the Government into the banking business, I would do it through the central banking system, and if I was going to have a central bank I would make it the capital business of the central bank system. If I were going to favor the postal savings bank, I would at the same time organize a central bank system of which these funds should be the capital. I would not have it in some one place. I would have a head to it, but I would have branches all over the country, so that these accumulated funds, which constituted the capital of the central banking system, should be distributed ratably and fairly throughout the country. But I am not ready now to develop further than the suggestion that plan, because we have to confront at no distant day the question of a central bank, and when we do confront it we have to consider the question where its capital is to come from. If the central-banking system is to be safe, its capital must be of that character that we may term "reasonably permanent" in its location and as free from fluctuation as possible.

I think it is safe to say that the volume of money in the postal savings bank, the aggregate of it, would probably be as little fluctuating as any fund one could imagine in the world, and therefore, perhaps, would make the best basis for the central banking system. We certainly can not establish a central bank, if it is a bank in the ordinary sense of the word at all, upon money realized from the sale of bonds. The Government only receives money through certain limited channels—through the revenues at its custom-houses or from the internal-revenue system and such like. We can not take that as the capital of a central banking system. We have to look somewhere for money that will rest nearly permanently in the bank as a basis not only of circulation, but of issue. Now, if you want to get the money into the channels of trade—

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAWFORD in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FLINT. My attention was called a moment ago by the Senator from Idaho to the purchase of bonds with these funds, and to the fact that it would have a tendency probably to advance the price.

Mr. HEYBURN. It generally does.

Mr. FLINT. I agree with the Senator. The Government having purchased the bonds at the advanced prices, if it should be required to sell them at a loss to repay depositors where would the money come from to make up this loss?

Mr. HEYBURN. There is a question I would not undertake to answer, because I never would reach it. But it is a reason-

able question. I understand the Senator to inquire whence any loss would be compensated that the Government might suffer by reason of the depreciation of bonds it had purchased. Is that it?

Mr. FLINT. That is correct.

Mr. HEYBURN. There is no provision in this bill for it. The only provision is the ordinary commercial provision that it would come out of the pockets of the Government.

Mr. FLINT. There is another question I desire to ask the Senator, and that is whether or not, under the provisions of this bill permitting investments, the money could not be loaned on notes and mortgages? It says the money may be invested in the same bonds or securities in which the funds of savings banks are authorized to be invested by the laws of the State or Territory. I take it that most States and Territories permit the investment of the funds of such institutions in notes and mortgages.

Mr. HEYBURN. The State of California is made by one of the provisions of the bill one of the criteria.

Mr. FLINT. If the State has no such regulation, then the laws of California and New York apply, and in New York and California the banks are permitted to loan money on note and mortgage, and under this bill the trustees could make such loans in the several States of the United States, and there might be losses on those loans.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am under an obligation to the Senator from California for the valuable suggestions he has made as to the reckless, careless manner of this proposed legislation, that contains no provision for protection against those conditions; and you might multiply them many times over, conditions not imaginary, but such conditions as arise every day in the banking and business world and with which all men of affairs are familiar. If this law is to contain some safeguard against those conditions, let us have it brought forth; but if the only safeguard is the plaudits that we hear of the men who hold these positions to-day and the promise as to the men who will hold them to-morrow, it is a mighty poor kind of security against the loss to the Government. The depositors can lose nothing as long as the Government of the United States is solvent and Congress is willing to authorize the issuance of bonds to cover losses.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SHIVELY. Then under this bill at last the general taxpayer in furnishing the security.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; and, Mr. President, as suggested by the Senator from California, it being allowed that the funds may be invested according to the rules of insurance or trust companies that invest in notes and mortgages, again would arise one of those cases that I have before referred to, of a contest between the Government and our creditors as to who should have the proceeds of the sale of this property.

Did anyone ever hear of the responsible proposition advanced that a government should loan the money gathered up through the postal savings banks as the ordinary money lender lends it, without any legal boundary or restriction or safeguard thrown around it? It is not even provided that it shall be a preferred claim against any fund. No governmental supervision is provided for over the corporations whose bonds the Government would buy, and the stability and value of the bonds could not be protected by the Government in any way. A railroad could be thrown into the hands of a receiver by a county court, and the Government would be holding its bonds as security for money that belonged to these depositors.

The banks in which the Government places the money under the terms of its deposits would be the poorest class of banks so far as security is concerned, because, as has been said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]—and his information is unquestionably accurate—the very large majority of the strong banks in the country would not participate in it, and those that did reach out for it would be the last ones that ought to have it.

Mr. President, we are about to vote upon an amendment here containing provisions that only add to the objections to the bill; that make it more difficult for the Government and easier for the banks to shift this money from one part of the country to the other.

I inquired when the Senator from Montana was speaking whether or not the prohibition which contained in the amendment against these three men, transferring the money from one part of the country to the other, applied to the banks; and, of course, he said no, because it does not. How could we, under any power that is vested in us, control the right of the banks,

in whose hands we place this money, to send the money where they please? We do not even require them to carry a reserve in the home bank. They could send every dollar of it away. They can not do that with any other funds that they have. They must maintain a reserve under the law against ordinary deposits. They carry no reserve under this proposed amendment as against these deposits, and we tie our hands by placing the power, not in succeeding Congresses, but in succeeding appointive officers, who give no bond.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Idaho certainly did not intend to say that banks would be required to create no reserve against any of these deposits.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; they would not. The banks are not required to carry any reserve against deposits that are secured by bonds or sureties to-day.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I question it.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator is inaccurate, and I will call his attention to the law, if he desires to have it quoted. I am sure the Senator has confused the statutes.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think we will arrive at a conclusion after we read the law, and not before it.

Mr. CARTER. Section 5153 provides for the designation of certain national banks as United States depositories, and an act passed May 30, 1908, provides—

that the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, with reference to the reserves of national banking associations, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories.

Mr. HEYBURN. Of course, now, the Senator runs up against that and slides by it just as though he had not seen it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, let us be fair about this matter. I presume the Senator made an honest mistake in supposing the word "security" to be there, and that the statute would apply to all future acts of Congress.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I did not make any mistake.

Mr. CARTER. A correct interpretation of the statute to which I have referred clearly applies exclusively to the one hundred and sixty odd million dollars deposited in national banks on the basis of collateral security deposited by these banks. The collateral security amounts to some one hundred and eighty odd million dollars.

Mr. HEYBURN. I know; but go to the provision, if the Senator pleases, with reference to the reserves.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the exception to the general law.

Mr. CARTER. The exception is made of the reserve only as to moneys deposited under this peculiar section.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield.

Mr. BULKELEY. Designated depositories are required just as well to put up a collateral for their deposits.

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly, a designated depository is required by law.

Mr. BULKELEY. The Senator referred to the \$160,000,000, but it involves the daily deposit of postmasters and the revenue collected all through the country.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think the Senators understood, as well as they understand anything, that I was not referring, and I stated it plainly, to the class of balances carried to meet the current expenses. There is the other balance, where the Government places money, as it did three or four years ago, for all I know last year. That is an entirely different class of government deposits.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator will, I think, admit, because it is the fact, that the Government of the United States does not deposit one dollar of either general funds or current receipts in any national bank without the deposit of collateral security.

Mr. HEYBURN. Of course they do not; and does the Senator maintain that in that case, in a case where the Government had \$250,000,000 in two banks in New York with collateral security, whatever its character may have been, that those banks carried a reserve against that deposit?

Mr. CARTER. No, sir; because—

Mr. HEYBURN. They did not.

Mr. CARTER. Because they are specifically—

Mr. HEYBURN. I am referring to that class of deposits.

Mr. CARTER. Because they are specifically exempt from the reserve provision by the section of the statute enacted in 1908.

Mr. HEYBURN. That makes no difference.

Mr. CARTER. Prior to that time the banks were required to keep a reserve to cover the amounts of special deposits made on collateral, just as on other current funds.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator has conceded just exactly what I said. I differentiated between the two classes of deposits in the beginning of my remarks clearly and fairly, and there could be no mistake as to my reference to deposits that were secured by collateral, made under the second classification that I stated, and in that case I reassert it, because in response to an inquiry from one of the Senators in charge of the finance bill, when the information was unquestionably accurate, it was stated that they carried no reserves at all, and the argument was made to show why they did not.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Since my explanation quoting the statute so moved the Senator, I suspect possibly I did not understand his contention.

Mr. HEYBURN. That might be.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator's contention, as I understand it, was that no reserve would be required to be kept by the banks acting under the national banking act as against these postal savings-bank deposits. That statement is not according to the law. The only exemption is that made by the statute to which I have referred—deposits held in consequence of collateral security by depository banks designated under a special act of Congress.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator is so sure of that, why not incorporate into this bill a provision to that effect, as to the reserves which shall be carried by the banks that hold the money? Why not incorporate it in the bill? Would it meet with the approval of the Senator from Montana if an amendment is offered providing that a reserve of a certain per cent shall be carried against these deposits?

Mr. BULKELEY and Mr. CARTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield, and to whom?

Mr. HEYBURN. I have yielded to the Senator from Montana; and if the Senator from Montana does not object, I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BULKELEY. I wish to ask if this law does not simply apply to national banks, and there is no provision in the bill itself which requires state banks, which may be large depositories of this money, to have any reserve?

Mr. HEYBURN. I am obliged to the Senator for emphasizing the position which I took. Of course the Congress of the United States can make no provision requiring state banks to carry a reserve. We can focus this argument in a minute.

The Senator from Connecticut has very justly suggested that the state banks could carry no reserve against the deposits, and we have no power to compel them to do it. Therefore, would the Senator deposit these funds in a bank over which we have no control to prescribe the reserve which it should carry as a guaranty of its solvency?

Mr. BULKELEY. But, Mr. President, while you can not compel a state bank to maintain a reserve, you can by a provision of this bill provide that no deposit shall be made in a bank that is not required to maintain it, just the same as you require them to have state supervision. You can require them to maintain a reserve the same as national banks.

Mr. HEYBURN. We could prescribe such conditions here as would leave perhaps only one or two banks in the United States available as a depository for this money, but the change that has been brought about, the claim made for the bill, is that it extends the provisions to the state and other private banks. That is held up as being the item of merit in the new bill which is brought before us. Under the other bill it was provided that the money could be deposited only in national banks; and the cry went up, "You are going to shift so many hundreds of millions of dollars from the state banks and the insurance companies that do a banking business, and so on, to the national banks." That cry was sufficient to drown the demand for the yeas and nays on the bill in this body, and it went out, smothered to death by its own weight.

Now it comes back here with a provision that professes to extend the depositing capacity of the act to state and other banks, surety companies, and so on, and when the objection is made that they do not and can not be required to carry a reserve against the day of insolvency or embarrassment, it is suggested that they might be eliminated. If you eliminate them, you go back to where you were a year ago.

If you leave them in you are met by the unanswerable argument that the Government of the United States can in no way

control or insure their sufficiency. Yet that is to be voted in in this amendment. I think it would be wise to allow the amendment to lie over.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator from Idaho does not refer to my amendment, because he has not given the pending amendment the respect of a passing glance in the whole argument that he has made this afternoon. He has been arguing another amendment. I hope he will not require my little, simple, plain, obvious amendment to go over on account of the objections which he has so forcibly expressed this afternoon. The whole matter, I know, will be open for amendment on the policy of the bill, but I should like to come to an end of this particular part of it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the prohibition of the Senator from Iowa has come more nearly expressing what I may term the "measure of my toleration" of this bill than any other Senator who has discussed it. He is working in the right direction. His amendment provides that the withdrawals shall be made from the deposits in the State or Territory.

What I was saying was directed, at least in part, to the question how those deposits were to be kept in the State or Territory, and I was differentiating between the credit and the money, because if the United States Government or these three agents of the Government can not control that money, then this amendment would be without effect. If the money was sent away by the bank, the fact that it had not been authorized by the board or the act done by the board would be an ineffective proposition.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no attempt here made to change the general banking law of the United States or of any State. We are dealing with the banks precisely as other depositories might deal with the banks. I hope that the Senator from Idaho will not think that this has any effect whatsoever upon the power which the banks have to deal with the money the Government deposits with them.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I realize that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the Senator from Idaho will agree with me that it is wise. I do not ask him to agree that the bill is wise, because he has a very positive and somewhat persuasive view of the bill as a whole; but this simply means to say that if the depositories in New York want their money from the Government the Government can not go to the banks in Iowa and ask them for the money with which to pay off the depositories in New York. The whole course of the argument of the Senator from Idaho is in harmony with the policy that is attempted to be put in the bill by the amendment I have now offered.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Iowa let us talk together about this for a moment. It has a limitation in it as well as an enlarged right upon the people, because it might be held that if there was insolvency or failure in the fund within a State, because the fund would fall below the deposits, the depositor could not look to any other fund. Do you think that is sufficiently protected in that language?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think that the contingency is proximate enough to even be considered, but I have no objection, as I suggested—

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. CUMMINS. As I suggested to the Senator from Nebraska, if it is desired to provide for that very remote possibility it can be put in anywhere, in a dozen different places in the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator allow me to suggest right here, under that construction of the statute—that is to say, if the deposits in a State were impaired to the extent of a dollar, if the orders in that State, which must be exactly coextensive with the post-offices, were presented, there would be a shortage. That is evident. Now, could you draw against the fund of some other State for that?

Mr. CUMMINS. Possibly not; but it is very clear that before long, if the views of the Senator from Idaho are sound with regard to the condition in his own State—and I do not doubt his accuracy in that respect—the Government will have in the Treasury, or in some other form of security, all the deposits that are made at post-offices in Idaho; and there is no prohibition here against taking those deposits and using them for the purpose of paying depositories anywhere.

Mr. HEYBURN. There is an implied prohibition here.

Mr. CUMMINS. Only as to banks.

Mr. HEYBURN. It says the withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State or Territory in which they are made. It does not provide that they may be paid out of any general

fund. Does the Senator think that is sufficiently comprehensive to the public?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no right to consume the Senator's time in these interruptions.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not object.

Mr. CUMMINS. All I ask is that if there is some contingency that is not provided for by the amendment I have proposed, then I hope the Senator will amend my amendment or suggest an amendment that will cover the danger he has in view, and not put my amendment under the weight of his wrath against the bill generally. I should like to see it perfected in this respect and then take up the question of policy which he has so ably argued this afternoon.

Mr. HEYBURN. I suggest, offhand, an amendment that will perhaps meet the Senator's approval. It is to make it read:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State or Territory so far as the fund on deposit in such State or Territory may be sufficient.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. And in the event that it shall not be sufficient, that they may be paid out of the accumulated fund in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I merely suggest that amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I recognized, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKET] first mentioned it, that there might possibly be a time when the money deposited in the banks of any State or Territory would not be sufficient to meet the withdrawals of that State. I fancy that it would not occur in a million years, if we endure that long. But, nevertheless, I am willing to provide for the last and remote contingency.

Mr. HEYBURN. Now, here is the second clause:

And so far as practicable from the deposits in the community in which the depositor withdrawing resides.

Suppose a man makes a deposit in Iowa, and makes it to the limit, \$5,000, and he afterwards resides in Idaho. From which fund would he withdraw?

Mr. CUMMINS. In that particular case, the general rule or policy I am seeking to maintain would be departed from, and the deposits made in the State of Idaho would be used to pay the depositor, although at the time the deposit was made he may have lived in Iowa and made his deposit in Iowa, but it would not affect in anywise the right of the depositor to get his money, and that is the thing, I fancy, that the Senator from Idaho is particularly solicitous to govern and secure.

Mr. HEYBURN. It would affect the right of depositors in Idaho to the extent that the Iowa man came and depreciated the fund in Idaho. How would that fund be recouped?

Mr. CUMMINS. By citizens of Idaho moving into Iowa; and I hope they will move there in large numbers.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, Mr. President, that only points the wisdom of this legislation. I do not mean the wisdom of the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], because his ability is such that we must recognize it, especially in legal matters, and his amendment was skillfully drawn, but this question is bigger than all of the amendments that you will ever get adopted.

Mr. CUMMINS. I realize that. I am not attempting in anywise to minimize the scope of the great question of policy involved in this bill as a whole, but I do not think that these considerations relate to that particular amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I took this amendment in my hand for the purpose of concentrating my remarks upon it, having been charged with having forgotten.

Mr. President, it will be seen that every principle touching the manner of the deposit or the withdrawal of these funds that I have discussed this afternoon is wrapped up in this amendment in some form; but if we are going to turn it all over to a board, not selected by Congress, but to be selected by whoever may hereafter occupy the office of President, we do not need to legislate on the subject at all. As I suggested, I think, yesterday, we might change the title of the bill and denominate it "A bill to provide for the collection of the money of the poor people to be used by a board of trustees to be appointed by the President under such terms and conditions as they may hereafter adopt."

I do not care to now occupy more time on the amendment, but there are a great many questions yet reserved in this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAGE. Just a moment, Mr. President. I should like to say a few words.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] seems to think we are delegating too much power to this board of trustees. On the other hand, I believe that the tendency of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is to inject into the bill a regulation of so many of the small details as to make the bill impracticable. To illustrate: Instead of leaving the question of securities for the board of trustees, we provide that when a bank secures a deposit of the postal funds it shall give security satisfactory to the board of trustees, and after the money has been placed in the hands of the bank it shall not thereafter be withdrawn except under very peculiar conditions.

It seems to me that in the very nature of things the security which may be deposited to-day as security for funds, in five years may have depreciated so that the security will be insufficient. We must leave some discretion to this board of trustees.

Again, the bill provides that any bank which is subject to national or state supervision may take these deposits. I do not know, however, of any way in which the board of trustees can compel the state supervisors or the state bank examiners to disclose what they find about a bank.

The provisions do not seem to dovetail as they ought to do if you undertake to tie the matter up in this way. So I say we ought to leave a discretion in the hands of the board of trustees, so that they may at all times preserve the high character of the securities, that they may at all times either get such satisfactory information from the state examiner as they must have, or else not be compelled to make the deposit, or, having made it, shall not be compelled to leave it in the bank if they think it unsafe.

Furthermore, in looking over the details of this bill, which its framers have tried to tie up with so much nicety, I can not see that any provision is made for fresh deposits in a bank which may at the time it received the original deposit have given satisfactory security. The law says that the funds thereafter deposited shall be made in this or that bank. There is no provision here that the bank shall in advance deposit security for that fund. The result may be that the current deposit will be without security.

Mr. CARTER. Before the Senator proceeds in that behalf with the provision which empowers the board of trustees to make the regulations for the receipt, transmission, custody, investment, and so forth, of these funds, it seems to me that it would be an eminently appropriate regulation for the board to stipulate that no bank should receive a deposit until the security had been provided and approved; and I doubt not, under the general authority to make regulations, they would so provide.

Mr. PAGE. I have no doubt that in the absence of specific directions to the contrary that would be correct, but may I ask the Senator from Montana if he believes that under the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa the board of trustees would have a right to withdraw the funds from a bank which, from any cause, they came to believe was becoming insolvent, or from a bank the securities of which, from any cause, they thought were becoming weaker and less satisfactory?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Or for any other cause.

Mr. PAGE. Or for any other cause.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it is probable that the right of the board in that direction might be made more specific by an amendment which would require the banks to maintain indemnity bonds or collateral security to the satisfaction of the board of trustees, and whenever the board reached the conclusion that the security or the collateral was inadequate or unsatisfactory, the funds could undoubtedly be withdrawn if such amendment were provided.

Mr. PAGE. I have no doubt that this bill can be amended in that particular so as to make it satisfactory; but if, in a casual reading of this bill, I can find two or three fatal objections, is it not probably true that we are here in this Hall trying to frame a bill which, when put to the test, will be found to be impracticable; a bill which can not be utilized for the purpose for which it is drawn, and should we not set forth here the purpose of this act, to wit, to keep these funds in the State from which they came, and leave the matter with the trustees to carry out the spirit of this law in some way without attempting to hamper them with rules? It seems to me that we can; and that, it seems to me, would be the better way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. KEAN. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to have the amendment again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. As modified, the amendment is to insert in line 7, section 7, after the word "prescribe," the following:

Withdrawals shall be paid from the deposits in the State or Territory, so far as the postal funds on deposit in said State or Territory may be sufficient for the purpose, and, so far as practicable, from the deposits in the community in which the depositor withdrawing resides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator having in charge this bill a question. The bill now provides that not less than 2½ per cent shall be paid per annum, and by an amendment to-day we have provided that this shall not be a matter of profit to the Government. Now, Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he has any objection in section 6, line 1, before the words "two per centum," to inserting "not less than," so that the depositors in certain contingencies might be granted a little higher rate of interest than 2 per cent? Suppose that a large fund had accumulated. We are not going to make any profit out of it, according to our own declaration. Might not the board of trustees be permitted for a time, we will say, to allow a little higher rate of interest to the poor people who have been furnishing the money? If the Senator objects to such an amendment, of course I will not offer it.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator is well aware that it is not the desire to put this postal savings institution into competition with the savings banks or other institutions paying interest on small deposits. I imagine that in a very short time there might be an almost irresistible demand made upon the trustees for an increase of the rate if they were empowered to make such increase. It seems to me wiser policy for the time being, pending the thorough installation of the system, to have stability in that particular as far as practicable.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think there is force in that; and yet I will say to the Senator that I am somewhat troubled as to what we are going to do with this money if we get a large accumulation of it. We have announced that we are not going to run this institution as a matter of profit to the Government. If we get a very large accumulation of money, what are we going to do with it?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, according to the provisions of the bill as it was originally reported—and there is nothing in the amendment contrary thereto—the funds will be deposited in the banks in the neighborhood where received on the approval of securities by indemnity bond or collateral. Through the operation of this we have an investment made automatically by the mere deposit under contractual arrangement for interest, and at the same time the money is left in the community to enrich the channels of trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, of course in a matter of that kind I defer to the better judgment of the Senator from Montana, and will not offer the amendment which I had in mind; and yet it does seem to me that if these poor men are contributing money sufficiently to warrant a little higher rate than 2 per cent they ought to have the benefit of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I have been notified by a number of Senators that they desired to speak upon this measure before it came to a vote. I do not care to stand here in the position of one holding the bill against their coming. So I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho withhold the motion?

Mr. HEYBURN. I withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. CARTER. Before that motion is put, and for the purpose of advising Senators who desire to address the Senate on this measure of the time when a vote will be taken, I ask unanimous consent that the final vote be taken on the bill on Thursday of next week at the hour of 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. HEYBURN. I object. I would discuss it if it were debatable, but it is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, then I hope the Senator will yield for a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senate desires to proceed to the consideration of executive business, I will withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BULKELEY. I hope before that motion is put the Senator will allow me to ask for the consideration of a short bill. I have to leave town to-morrow for a somewhat extended absence, and there is a bill, authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Connecticut River, in the State of Connecticut, that I should like to have passed.

Mr. CARTER. I withdraw my motion for that purpose.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BULKELEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5680) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Connecticut River, in the State of Connecticut, between the towns of Old Saybrook and Old Lyme.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "River," to insert "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Connecticut, acting through the Saybrook and Lyme Connecticut River Bridge Commission, a commission created by the laws of the State of Connecticut, be, and hereby is, authorized to construct and maintain a drawbridge across the Connecticut River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between the towns of Old Saybrook and Old Lyme, in the State of Connecticut, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIGHT STATION AT BATTERY POINT, WASHINGTON.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. PILES. I ask the Senator from Montana to withhold his motion, in order that I may report a bill from the Committee on Commerce and ask for its present consideration.

Mr. CARTER. I withhold the motion for that purpose.

Mr. PILES. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4458) to increase the limit of cost of the light and fog-signal station to be established at Battery Point, Washington, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 181) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments of the Committee on Commerce were, in line 8, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty-three;" and in line 9, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirty-four" and insert "forty-seven," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of a light and fog-signal station to be established at Battery Point, Wash., heretofore authorized by the acts approved June 28, 1902, February 26, 1907, and March 4, 1907, is hereby increased by the sum of \$33,000, so as to make the total limit of cost \$47,000 instead of \$14,000, as heretofore authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CARTER. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 4, 1910, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1910.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles E. Marsh, at Greenville, N. H.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Louise B. Evans, at Agricultural College, N. Dak.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harry E. Munday, at Shepherdstown, W. Va.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1910.

The house met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Rev. John Van Schaick, jr.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, while I was absent yesterday at lunch a letter which I wrote was read. I am wholly responsible for every word that is in that letter and expressed my views exactly, and I do not regret having written it. The only thing I do regret is that there are some Members of this House so narrow-minded as to get the idea that the President of the United States or any of his subordinates had anything whatever to do with the writing of that letter. But it seems that our Democratic friends are ever ready to raise a howl or a roar when a piece of pie is cut and they do not share in it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking to a question of personal privilege. If the gentleman desires to make a political speech I have no doubt that this side will grant unanimous consent that he may do so. I do not think, however, that the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, then I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, a shining example of the fairness and nonpartisanship of the Democrats of this country can be seen in the shape of my district, which is almost 400 miles long and at one place only about 27 miles wide. It was gerrymandered by the Democratic party for the sole purpose of making it Democratic forever, but, thank goodness, there have been enough Republicans who have removed from the North to make it Republican, and it will remain Republican so long as it stays in the shape that it is now in. Another shining example of Democratic fairness can be seen in the vote cast in one county in my State, which is strongly Democratic. One township of that county had, it was estimated, 2,000 persons living in it, and yet a vote was cast of more than 1,500. The Democratic chairman was asked how he accounted for that. He said:

Why, we always vote the name of every man, living or dead, who has ever lived in this township within the last forty years, and to make it good measure we vote his horses' and his dogs' names sometimes.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18162—the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. CAMPBELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The business pending before the committee when it rose on Tuesday last was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Page 38, after line 20, insert:

"Paper test: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to test such plants and woods as may require tests to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, \$14,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins I would inquire to what section this is offered as an amendment?

Mr. MANN. This is a new paragraph, to be inserted at the end of line 20 on page 38. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is intended, if adopted, to take the place of the item on page 62 of the bill in relation to paper tests. The purpose of inserting the paragraph at this place is in order to put the appropriation under the control of the Forestry Bureau, where it is now actually controlled. When the item on page 62 was first inserted in the bill, several years ago, the money carried was divided between the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forestry Service, but since that time a new item has been

inserted in the bill, carried in the pending bill, for the work done by the Bureau of Plant Industry, under the head of the "Plant Industry Bureau," and this item, I think, should properly be carried under the Bureau of Forestry. When the appropriation was made, it was first intended by the department to divide the \$10,000 between the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forest Service. I have become interested in the matter through my service on the special committee, and I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture, and it was determined that this appropriation should be expended by the Forest Service.

The amendment also carries an increase in the amount from \$10,000 to \$14,000. There have been two plans proposed in reference to this work of investigation of the question of making ground-wood pulp out of other woods than spruce. Those plans are set forth in the Record on page 1361. Both plans contemplate the cooperation of the American Pulp and Paper Association, that association furnishing a portion of the money. One of the plans contemplates that the Government shall furnish \$14,000 and the American Pulp and Paper Association shall furnish \$21,200, and that is the plan upon which the item of \$14,000 is based, if it shall be adopted. The other plan proposed would cost the Government \$6,000 and the American Pulp and Paper Association \$4,770. One plan contemplates an endeavor to test the making of ground wood other than spruce in a commercial way, and the other contemplates work in the laboratory only. We are in this situation, that to-day we make wood pulp, the basis of all cheap papers, practically only out of spruce wood. We have a very limited quantity of spruce wood in the United States, and we are, or we shortly will be, depending upon Canada for our spruce-wood supply. We want to see if it is not possible to make ground-wood pulp in a commercial way so that it can be used as a basis for cheap print paper, as spruce now is, out of other kinds of wood, and the present contemplation is to try balsam, hemlock, and jack pine. There are immense quantities of jack pine scattered over the United States, most of it valueless because as a rule it is not large enough to make good saw logs. If we can discover a practical commercial method of making ground wood out of the jack pine that grows so readily we will not be dependent on Canada for our future cheap-paper supply, and even if it shall demonstrate to us by our experiments that it is not possible to make this ground-wood pulp out of other kinds than spruce, it will be worth to us many times what it will cost, because we will then know that we must either raise the spruce through governmental agencies or else depend upon the Canadian supply of spruce, and for that reason, while it is not yet definitely settled that the \$14,000 will be required instead of \$6,000, I hope the House will consent to authorize the expenditure of the \$14,000 on the part of the Government, which will be accompanied by \$21,200 from the pulp and paper association, if they shall conclude that that is the best method of making the investigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understood the gentleman to say that the association of manufacturers contribute an amount of money equal to a third more than is proposed to be appropriated for the same purpose.

Mr. MANN. The manufacturers have offered to furnish the equipment, which, if that plan were adopted, will cost \$18,000; the cost of the installation of the experiment, which will be \$2,000; and the cost of the wood for a year's supply, which is estimated at \$1,200, so that the amount to be contributed by the manufacturers will be \$21,200, as against \$14,000 proposed to be expended by the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does that proposition give the manufacturers any sort of supervision or control over the experiments?

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nor any control over the discovery?

Mr. MANN. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. TAWNEY. The \$14,000 would not be the total contribution of the Government?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Would not the salaries of the men engaged in making the investigations be paid out of the appropriations made for the payment of their salaries in addition to the other?

Mr. MANN. No; it is paid out of this sum; this covers the question of salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I shall not oppose this amendment. It does not materially change the bill, and I am inclined to think that the change it does make is proper, in view of the

facts that have been presented by the gentleman from Illinois. When it was first determined, three years ago, to enter upon this investigation, it was not known exactly in which bureau the work would properly come, and the paragraph providing for it was accordingly inserted as an independent paragraph, so that the Secretary might designate men in any bureau of the department to engage in the study of the problem. As the work has progressed, it seems to have divided naturally into two branches, one of them conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry for testing and breeding fibrous plants which may be used for paper making, and the other one, the one now under consideration, passing to the Forest Service, which has been making a study as to the value of various kinds of trees for pulp-making purposes. Inasmuch as the work done under the authority of the paragraph in question is now confined to the Forest Service, I see no reason why the provision authorizing the appropriation to pay for it should not come under the Forest Service. In reference to the increase of the amount, I believe the House will concur in the judgment of the gentleman from Illinois that if by the expenditure of \$4,000 more than was contemplated we can have a test made upon a commercial scale of new methods or of the availability of new materials, the money will be well expended. For these reasons, therefore, I trust that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a word, which I think is due to Doctor Galloway. When this item was put in the bill last year the department divided this \$10,000 between the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forest Service, and the other \$10,000 went to the Bureau of Plant Industry. I called on Doctor Galloway in reference to the matter, and explained the situation to him—a more courteous and efficient public officer, I think everyone who meets Doctor Galloway will say, has never drawn a salary or filled an office without a salary—as it was wholly with his acquiescence that the change which was made was brought about.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out of the bill lines 7 to 12, on page 62.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to strike from the bill certain lines, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, lines 7 to 12, both inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the transportation or traveling expenses of any forest officer or agent except he be traveling on business directly connected with the Forest Service and in furtherance of the works, aims, and objects specified and authorized in and by this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article; but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons, without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, in order to accomplish what was intended by this proviso, I move to amend by inserting after the word "persons," in line 6, the words "when requested."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 6, after the word "persons," insert "when requested," so that it will read, "giving out to all persons, when requested, without discrimination," etc.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the first part of this paragraph or proviso is to prohibit the expenditure of any part of the appropriations made for the purpose of paying for the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article. Then the language follows which says:

But this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons, without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

Now, it has come to my notice, and there has been forwarded to me a number of articles prepared in the Forestry Bureau for publication in newspapers and magazines, notwithstanding the prohibition in this proviso. This will continue as long as they are allowed to give newspaper and magazine writers and publishers any facts or official information of value to the public, for it does not say in what form the information shall or may be furnished. This is why the fore part of the proviso is violated. While they are prohibited from preparing articles for magazines and newspapers, they are in fact preparing articles for

magazines and newspapers under the provision which says that they are authorized to give out without discrimination certain facts or official information. Now, if the language is inserted which I propose here, whereby they would be limited to the giving out of facts or official information only upon request, then we would stop what the committee and what Congress has heretofore attempted to stop, namely, the wholesale preparation of newspaper and magazine articles.

I think that would materially reduce the amount which has heretofore been expended for the preparation of newspaper and magazine articles that have been prepared by the bureau under the language of the existing law. This only carries out the spirit and intent of the law; that is, they were to give out official information and facts when requested to do so. If any writer or any newspaper desires information concerning the work of the bureau, and requests that information, then the department would be authorized to furnish it, but it would not be authorized to prepare, voluntarily, for the magazines and newspapers general articles on the subject of the work of the bureau. I think the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I think the proposed amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] would defeat the very purpose of this proviso of the bill. The object here is clearly stated and fairly and reasonably inferred, namely, to have the department give out information and facts which it thinks is of value to the public. Now, then, if you limit it to the giving out of these facts and furnishing this information only to those who may request it, it will be, in effect, an inhibition against any general publication of important information or facts that are required and the public may never get unless somebody hunts around and finds them out and publishes them in the interest of the publication which he represents.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Ohio is aware that this proviso is put in here for the purpose of putting a stop to or breaking up the practice of having men in the bureaus devote their time to the preparation of newspaper and magazine articles.

Mr. KEIFER. That is already taken care of separately in the first part of the proviso.

Mr. TAWNEY. But that practice continues to-day just as it did before the existing language of the law.

Mr. KEIFER. It will not be carried at all by the amendment proposed.

Mr. TAWNEY. It will be, if it becomes a law and the law is observed.

Mr. KEIFER. If observed, it would not. Let us read this proviso carefully:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article.

Now, that is complete within itself; that part of the proviso is well understood, and it works a prohibition against paying out or using any part of the appropriation for the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, whereas under the gentleman's amendment that very thing would be done.

Then follows:

But this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons, without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

The gentleman from Minnesota proposes to put in after the word "persons" the words "upon request." That is to say, in effect, under any fair construction, if this language is in it, that the information can not be gained and the facts shall not be published under any circumstances for the benefit of anybody unless somebody makes a request for it. That will be the effect of the language, and it has nothing to do with the first part of the proviso, which is intended to be accomplished by prohibiting the use and preventing the use of or the preparation of matter for any magazine or newspaper articles.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you mean to say that this would in any way interfere with the department or the Bureau of Forestry publishing, as it does now publish, full information with regard to the work of the bureau in the bulletins published by the bureau?

Mr. KEIFER. I do not mean to say that; but I do mean to say that it would prohibit the giving out of information that might be of great interest to the public and prevent that information being given out, and the facts published at the time that it ought to be given to the public, unless somebody requested it to be given out. The printing of the reports of the different bureaus, the printing of the bulletins that go to the

archives of the different departments and are picked up and sent out as it happens or as people call for them, is another thing. But there may be very important information, very important facts, that the public should have, and that they should be permitted to give, which the amendment proposed would prohibit being given out at all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], because I believe that it would prevent the people getting a good deal of valuable information that they are entitled to receive. It so happens that there is given out from the department information that can be condensed in small space that is not of sufficient size or dignity to be published in a bulletin. Now, then, this is given out gratis to many newspapers throughout the United States.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, it is given out in the shape of articles prepared in violation of this law.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman from Minnesota had had a great deal of newspaper experience, he would be cognizant of the fact that if this information is prepared in the department and given out in its prepared form it would be of greater benefit to the public than if prepared in a thousand little newspaper offices throughout the country.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, that would be in violation of this law.

Mr. KEIFER. Not if your amendment is in.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is what the amendment is intended to prevent.

Mr. KEIFER. The effect would be just what you say it ought not to be.

Mr. MORSE. There are thousands of little newspapers published throughout this country glad to publish this material free, but they will not request it. If the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota prevails, a great deal of valuable information will be prevented from getting to the people. They are entitled to it. The newspapers are willing to grant the space free; and I believe we should permit the department to send this out without being specifically requested in each particular instance. I believe that the Forestry Bureau of the Agricultural Department is one of the most valuable activities of the Government. We are paying these scientific people for the work they are doing, and the wider publicity we can give to the work being done in this bureau the greater will be the benefit received from that work. Now, the intention of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is to restrict the giving out of this information, which he himself does not say is of no value.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in ten minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Minnesota permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in ten minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is not the gentleman's proposition self-contradictory? The gentleman from Minnesota proposes that the information shall not be given out except upon request. Now, how is anybody to know that they have the information? You have got, in the first place, to tell somebody that you have got it before they will ask for it. They are not going to ask for something that they do not know anything about. Therefore, if they have discovered a new thing and are not allowed to tell anybody about it, nobody will ask for it. The proposition contradicts itself.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LONGWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 18282. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1910, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15384. An act making appropriation for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3983. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 302), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reser-

vation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," and all amendments thereto; and

S. 614. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Dewitt Eastman," approved January 8, 1909.

The message also announced that the Vice-President had appointed Mr. PURCELL a member of the joint committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the joint resolution of January 19, 1910, entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the Department of the Interior and its several bureaus, officers and employees, and of the Bureau of Forestry, in the Department of Agriculture, and its officers and employees," in place of Mr. PAYNTER, resigned from said committee.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture, including the Bureau of Forestry, is expending large sums of money annually in reports and bulletins which fully explain the activities of the department and the bureaus and all new discoveries that are made from time to time in these bureaus and in the department. The law especially provides for that, in order that the people may be fully informed as to what the department is doing. Now, up until about two years ago the practice of preparing articles in the Bureau of Forestry for publication in magazines and newspapers, articles that were intended primarily for the purpose of boosting the bureau rather than giving information to the public, had been abused to such an extent that Congress, in order to put a stop to it, expressly provided that no part of the appropriation for the Bureau of Forestry should be used for the purpose of paying, in whole or in part, for the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article.

Now, the intention of Congress was to put a stop to the preparation of magazine and newspaper articles. It is not the function of any department to maintain a press association for the purpose of exploiting itself, and to put a stop to it Congress put in this prohibition. But under the language which follows that which I have just read the practice is continued. I have during the last year received a number of completed articles prepared in the Bureau of Forestry for publication in newspapers, and sent broadcast, to be released on a certain day. Now, the intent of Congress was that the giving out of facts and official information should be limited to those persons who desired the information. Instead of that the bureau has gone on and continued its press agency in the bureau, at an expense, I understand, of something like \$70,000 during the last fiscal year. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that this press-agent service is comparatively new in the departments here at the seat of government. It is not only in the Agricultural Department; it is extending to all the departments; and as the result of it, and as the result of the influence which these departments are able to wield through the press of this country, it is almost impossible for a man to stand upon this floor and criticize a bureau, or the department, without himself being subjected to severe criticism, no matter how just his complaint may be against the bureau. These press agents and these publicity bureaus in the several departments of the Government are maintained largely for the purpose of exploiting and popularizing the bureau, to the end that its activities may be increased, and also its appropriations from year to year. One reason why many of the appropriations for a number of bureaus in the various departments of the Government can not be kept down is because of the influence which these bureaus exert to-day in the press of the country in the districts of the several Members of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the department ought to withhold any information from the public, outside of the information that is published in the reports and in the bulletins; but I do say that the giving out of any additional information or facts should be limited to those who request it, because those are the people who undoubtedly would want to use it, and in the use of it they might perhaps satisfy their readers; but the idea of maintaining generally, in view of the prohibition here, a press agency in the Bureau of Forestry was not, I say, the intent of Congress when this prohibition was enacted.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman's proposition were enacted into law might there not be danger that those newspapers which have correspondents in Washington, and magazines which do not, would request this information not given to the public generally, and other papers would not be able to get it, so that the very purpose of the gentleman would fail, in that all of the in-

formation would be furnished to the newspaper correspondents and the magazines who can get it by request, and the little newspapers that reach the people in the country would not be able to get the information?

Mr. TAWNEY. The small newspapers that the gentleman refers to will get their information as well from the metropolitan press represented in the city of Washington—and that is where they do get the most of their information now—and it serves the same purpose as if they got it directly from the department. The gentleman does not pretend to say that the Bureau of Forestry is furnishing newspaper articles for all country newspapers; the articles prepared in the bureau to-day in violation of law are furnished to the metropolitan press.

Mr. MANN. I mean to say that all of the memoranda and all that the bulletins cover are furnished to everybody, but under the gentleman's proposition they could get only what was furnished to the magazines.

Mr. TAWNEY. No man can go into any department to-day and obtain any information except that which is prepared by the press agent in the interests of the bureau and the department.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how the gentleman's amendment would change it.

Mr. TAWNEY. It would limit it in this bureau to the furnishing of information upon request.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we spend several hundred thousand dollars a year through the Forest Service to acquire information that we think will be useful to the people of the United States. It would certainly be gross extravagance to spend large sums to acquire this information and then refuse to disseminate it. I do not entertain the feeling of nervousness and agitation in relation to the alleged press bureau of the Forest Service which has prompted the gentleman from Minnesota to offer this amendment. More than two years ago it was charged that such a bureau was maintained and was used for the purpose of exploiting and popularizing the service. It was alleged that large sums of money were expended annually to defray the expense of preparing newspaper and magazine articles, the primary purpose of which was to exploit the bureau rather than to convey information to the people. In order to correct this alleged evil a proviso was inserted in the bill providing that no part of the appropriation should be expended for such purpose.

The bureau did not oppose it, the Agricultural Committee did not oppose it, because the bureau had always declared that no such articles were prepared, and there was therefore no objection to the inhibition against it. The work which is done by the alleged bureau is simply to send out broadcast over the country items of information that would be useful to the people in the conservation of their forests, in the more economical use of timber, in the best methods of lumbering, and things of that sort. And these news items are not furnished alone to the big magazines, but the bureau maintains a mailing list of 750,000 names, and in that list are included practically all of the newspapers in the country, small as well as great. Through the use of the newspapers there was obtained for these paragraphs last year a circulation of over 9,000,000 copies, at no cost to the Government except for the preparation of the articles. If these articles had not contained useful information they certainly would not have been so widely printed.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. What is the difference between information furnished the newspapers and magazines and that furnished in the bulletins of the bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. A bulletin is a longer and more carefully worked out article; it is a complete study of some particular question.

Mr. TAWNEY. The information is the same. They may be written in a little better style, perhaps, but the information is the same, and if you continue this service, what is the use of the bulletin?

Mr. SCOTT. A bulletin is a longer and more complete study of some particular subject. It may contain 30 or 40 pages, while these articles would rarely take more than half a column in a newspaper. They contain brief suggestions, bits of information covering a very wide range of subjects, extremely useful and yet not of a character which would justify publication in bulletin form, and by being sent out to the newspapers they are given immeasurably wider circulation than would be possible in any other way.

I think it would be against public interest and would impair the usefulness of the department to have the amendment which

the gentleman from Minnesota offers inserted in the bill, and I trust that the House will vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during the past several weeks the local press has devoted considerable space to informing us as to the attitude of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle with reference to the so-called "Taft policies." We have been informed that gentlemen on that side have been exceedingly diligent and active in declaring themselves unalterably, unwaveringly, and eternally committed to all of the so-called "Taft policies." One of these policies, as I learn from his messages sent to the House by the President, is the purpose of the administration to increase the postal rates on newspapers and periodicals, thus further taxing the intelligence of the country. Not long ago the public press informed us that the President in a public speech declared that the Payne-Aldrich tariff measure was the best tariff bill ever passed by Congress. This sentiment has been repeated and indorsed innumerable times by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Even the Speaker himself is credited in the public press with having quoted with approval this sentiment of the President. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk a short telegram, clipped from the St. Louis Republic, which I desire to have read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

EVEN HOLINESS GETS COSTLY—PRICE OF BIBLES WILL GO UP ON MARCH 1 BECAUSE OF TARIFF.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 30, 1910.

The price of Bibles will go up on March 1, according to an announcement to-day by a large Bible publishing house, which has branches in Cincinnati, Kansas City, and San Francisco. The cause for the advance is the enforcement of the new tariff on imported leather and paper.

"Bibles are now about 20 per cent higher than they have ever been before," said a member of the firm. "The materials for the best Bibles have gone up so high in price on account of the tariff that we can not afford to continue to sell our output at prices now listed."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. So, Mr. Chairman, not content with its diabolical success, through oppressive rates, in taxing the Holy Bible out of the homes of the poor people, they are now bent on another policy almost as diabolical in its purpose and as injurious in its effects, and that is, to take away from the poor man the weekly newspaper. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican party, in its last dying efforts to perpetuate itself, has been forced to base its hope of success upon decreasing intelligence in the country and upon that chaotic condition of public morals which will exist when the weekly newspaper, that great source of information and wisdom, and the Bible of our mothers have been withdrawn from the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, it has been the uniform custom of this committee not to inject politics into the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill; but in view of the attitude taken by a member of the committee on the other side of the aisle, I wish to read a newspaper clipping for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman who has just taken his seat. It is as follows:

IMPORTS FREE OF DUTY VALUED AT \$699,799,771 IN 1909—MORE THAN HALF THE IMPORTS.

WASHINGTON, January 30, 1910.

More than half of the merchandise imported under the new tariff law enters the United States free of duty. The new act went into effect August 6, 1909, but the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor shows only full months in statements of imports and exports. Taking the full month of August, the share of the imports entering free of duty was 46.32 per cent; in September, 49.25 per cent; in October, 50.61 per cent; in November, 54.11 per cent; and in December, 55.96 per cent, the average for the entire five-month period being 51.5 per cent. This is a larger percentage of imports free of duty than under any prior law of this character except the act of 1890, which, admitting sugar free of duty, showed an unusually high proportion of non-dutiable imports. Prior to that time the highest annual average importation free of duty occurred in 1841, when 49.73 per cent of the imports were free of duty, the figures for 1840 being 48.82 per cent.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, there is a larger per cent of imports coming into the United States free of duty under the operation of this law which has brought down upon it the ire of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] than under any law in the history of the country since 1840, even including the

free-trade act which the gentleman from Missouri points to with pride, the Walker law of 1846.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. No; I will not.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Why, what is the matter with the gentleman?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the articles coming into the United States free of duty which make up the aggregate of these articles—

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. What are they?

Mr. COLE (continuing). Are the necessities of life, the necessities and not the luxuries; and when gentlemen on the other side of the aisle raise the question of a slight increase upon some of the luxuries, I point to the important fact that the rates of duty have been lowered—

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COLE. The rates of duty have been lowered on the necessities of life and increased on some of the luxuries.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has declined to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I thought I could ask him a second time, and the Chair would not take exception to it. If the Chair did not want to ask the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Ohio had already declined to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I wanted to ask the gentleman how many of those luxuries were controlled by the trusts. The people are getting no benefit from your darned tariff. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what kind of leather they use in their Bibles in Missouri, and I doubt seriously if they use that article down there at all—

Mr. HENRY W. PALMER. Which article, the leather or the Bibles?

Mr. COLE. The Bibles. Let us take the question of hides and skins—\$104,000,000 worth—and if that is not a necessity that goes into the home of every American workman I would like to know what is. The duty on both leather and paper, every item that enters into the make-up of a Bible, has been decreased. Tin, 27,500,000. That is the article upon which the Democrats defeated William McKinley for Congress in the state of Ohio in 1890, because they sent a lot of cheap tin peddlers around over the country telling the people that his tariff had raised the price of tin cups and tin pans. Now, \$27,500,000 worth of that article comes in free of duty.

Mr. BURLESON. Why does not the gentleman put all of that article into the Record?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the privilege of submitting this entire article and inserting the remainder of these articles into the Record, every one of which, with two exceptions, is a necessity of life and which is on the free list.

Mr. SABATH. There are no articles on the free list that the gentleman has read—

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take up any more time and shall content myself with the statement that I have made. The rest of the article is as follows:

The total value of all merchandise entering free of duty, which never reached as much as \$100,000,000 prior to 1873, passed the two hundred million line in 1880, the three hundred million line in 1891, the four hundred million line in 1892, the five hundred million line in 1905, the six hundred million line in 1907, and in the calendar year just ended was practically \$700,000,000, the exact figures being \$699,799,771. The principal articles forming this large total of nondutiable imports in the calendar year 1909 were: Hides and skins, \$104,000,000; india rubber, \$79,000,000; pig tin, \$27,500,000; raw silk, \$74,000,000; fibers, \$29,666,000; cotton, \$15,000,000; copper, \$40,000,000; coffee, \$86,500,000; tea, \$16,500,000; cacao, \$13,333,000; chemicals, \$52,500,000; art works, \$13,500,000; and undressed furs, \$12,750,000.

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I give notice now that I shall make the point of order upon any more political discussions; that side of the House wasted the day yesterday in political talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I move to strike out the last word—

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Wisconsin was on his feet.

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Ohio is inserting his statement in regard to hides I wish he would mention the number of dutiable and undutiable hides.

He could not receive that information from the department as they do not keep a record according to trade classification.

I insert a telegram showing that the department does not keep a record:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1910.

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,

House of Representatives:

Reports from collectors of customs to this department do not classify hides in the form indicated in your telegram.

BENJAMIN S. CABLE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to make the point of order against remarks not direct to the subject under discussion. I did not do it before because both of the Members who addressed the committee are members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WEISSE. I want the gentleman to put in a correct statement.

Mr. SCOTT. I can not be responsible for the gentleman's statements.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to say—

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, there has been so much misinformation circulated through the newspapers and otherwise as to the free distribution of vegetable and flower seed by the Government, as to the cost of the seed, the number of packages, and the cost of franking the seeds through the mails that I thought it worth while to have a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture as to the number of packages of such seed, the total weight of the seed, including containers or envelopes, and the average weight of packages. So on the 22d of January of this year I wrote the Secretary for this information, and I now read his reply to my inquiry:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1910.

Hon. T. W. SIMS,

House of Representatives.

Sir: In compliance with your request of January 22, 1910, I inclose herewith a memorandum showing the total weight of the seeds and their containers which enter into the congressional seed distribution for the present year. From this statement you will note that the average weight per package of vegetable seed is 2.16 ounces, and that the average weight per package of flower seed is 0.653 ounce.

Trusting that this information will fully answer your purpose, I am,
Very respectfully,

W. M. HAYS, Acting Secretary.

Weight of 1909-10 vegetable-seed distribution.
(10,006,000 packages.)

	Pounds.
Beans, 4,755 bushels	285,300
Corn, 5,432 bushels	244,440
Peas, 2,830 bushels	158,480
Beet	15,869
Brussels sprouts	8,334
Carrot	27,455
Collard	4,467
Cucumber	6,364
Endive	3,995
Kale	6,934
Kohl rabi	8,740
Lettuce	71,472
Muskmelon	7,700
Mustard	2,574
Okra	8,667
Parsley	13,650
Parsnip	31,300
Radish	142,943
Squash	6,613
Tomato	5,754
Turnip	43,582
Watermelon	13,400
Total	1,118,033

ENVELOPES.

4,271,000 No. 15, 13 pounds 3½ ounces per thousand	56,457
5,735,000 No. 5, 8 pounds 8 ounces per thousand	48,748

PACKETS.

4,271,000 No. 10, 8 pounds 6 ounces per thousand	35,770
6,697,000 No. 2a, 2 pounds 13½ ounces per thousand	19,045
5,010,000 No. 2, 2 pounds 8½ ounces per thousand	12,682
34,052,000 No. 1, 1 pound 12½ ounces per thousand	60,655

Total weight 1,351,390

One million three hundred and fifty-one thousand three hundred and ninety pounds (total weight) divided by 10,006,000 (total number of packages) gives 2.16 ounces as average weight per package, or 135.07 pounds as average weight per thousand packages.

Weight of 1909-10 flower-seed distribution.
(1,863,000 packages.)

	Pounds.
Ageratum	5
Antirrhinum	250
Balsam	95
Calendula	1,334
Castor-oil bean	100
Celosia	10
Coreopsis	400
Candytuft	2,045

Weight of 1909-10 flower-seed distribution—Continued.

Pounds.

Cosmos	1,350
Cypress vine	109
Dianthus	438
Eschscholtzia	1,234
Four o'clock	134
Helianthus	294
Kochia	445
Lobelia	32
Morning-glory	1,700
Mignonette	1,800
Nasturtium, dwarf	7,550
Nasturtium, T.	5,500
Pansy	20
Petunia	5
Poppy, double	1,417
Poppy, single	1,342
Sweet alyssum	147
Sweet peas	14,000
Verbena	63
Zinnia	250
Total	42,069

ENVELOPES

5,000 No. 15, 13 pounds 3½ ounces per thousand	66
1,858,000 No. 5, 8 pounds 8 ounces per thousand	15,793

PACKETS.

2,010,000 No. 2, 2 pounds 8½ ounces per thousand	5,088
7,330,000 No. 1, 1 pound 12½ ounces per thousand	13,057

Total weight..... 76,073

Seventy-six thousand and seventy-three pounds (total weight) divided by 1,863,000 (total number of packages) gives 0.653 ounces as average weight per package, or 40.83 pounds as average weight per thousand packages.

By reference to the letter I have just read from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture it is seen that the total weight of all the vegetable seed, including the weight of the containers, or envelopes, is 1,351,390 pounds; that the average weight of each package is 2.15 ounces, or practically 2 ounces to the package; that the average weight of a package of flower seed is about one-half ounce, including weight of wrapper or container; that the total weight of all flower seed is 76,073 pounds; that if postage was paid on all the vegetable seed sent out by congressional frank at the rate paid on second-class matter it would amount to only \$135,513.90, and at same rate the total postage paid on flower seed would be only \$760.75.

As shown by the report of the Postmaster-General the total weight of the mail of all classes for 1907 was 1,290,358,284 pounds. It is thus seen that the total weight of all seeds—vegetable and flower—is less than one one-thousandth part of the whole. Therefore, the amount of the total deficit for last year being \$17,500,000, not over one one-thousandth part can justly be charged to the seed-franking privilege, amounting in all to the sum of \$17,500.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Forest Service, \$5,043,700.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, by a vote of the House on Tuesday the Department of Agriculture was directed to include the geographical location of each of the national forests in the list of forests printed in the bill, and in order that my compliance with that direction may be a matter of record I ask unanimous consent to insert the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "forests," in line 9, page 25, down to and including the word "dollars," in line 14, page 37, and substitute the following:

"Absaroka National Forest, Mont., \$20,844;
 "Alamo National Forest, N. Mex., \$33,449;
 "Angeles National Forest, Cal., \$50,644;
 "Apache National Forest, Ariz., \$31,414;
 "Arapaho National Forest, Colo., \$21,560;
 "Arkansas National Forest, Ark., \$32,960;
 "Ashley National Forest, Utah and Wyo., \$19,668;
 "Battlement National Forest, Colo., \$15,700;
 "Beartooth National Forest, Mont., \$17,299;
 "Beaverhead National Forest, Mont. and Idaho, \$31,837;
 "Bighorn National Forest, Wyo., \$32,238;
 "Bitterroot National Forest, Mont., \$31,391;
 "Blackfeet National Forest, Mont., \$38,159;
 "Black Hills National Forest, S. Dak., \$44,746;
 "Boise National Forest, Idaho, \$27,925;
 "Bonneville National Forest, Wyo., \$22,822;
 "Cabinet National Forest, Mont., \$21,143;
 "Cache National Forest, Utah and Idaho, \$18,700;
 "California National Forest, Cal., \$26,240;
 "Caribou National Forest, Idaho and Wyo., \$20,200;
 "Carson National Forest, N. Mex., \$28,971;
 "Cascade National Forest, Oreg., \$37,280;
 "Challis National Forest, Idaho, \$21,600;
 "Chelan National Forest, Wash., \$42,195;
 "Chiricahua National Forest, Ariz. and N. Mex., \$21,131;
 "Choctawhatchee National Forest, Fla., \$9,009;
 "Chugach National Forest, Alaska, \$17,848;
 "Clearwater National Forest, Idaho, \$41,105;
 "Cleveland National Forest, Cal., \$38,783;
 "Choctetopa National Forest, Colo., \$17,704;

"Coconino National Forest, Ariz., \$50,226;
 "Coeur d'Alene National Forest, Idaho, \$45,976;
 "Colorado National Forest, Colo., \$19,854;
 "Columbia National Forest, Wash., \$23,376;
 "Colville National Forest, Wash., \$22,910;
 "Coronado National Forest, Ariz., \$24,212;
 "Crater National Forest, Oreg. and Cal., \$31,369;
 "Crook National Forest, Ariz., \$27,712;
 "Custer National Forest, Mont., \$12,847;
 "Dart National Forest, N. Mex., \$42,903;
 "Deerlodge National Forest, Mont., \$41,208;
 "Deschutes National Forest, Oreg., \$30,463;
 "Dixie National Forest, Utah and Ariz., \$16,600;
 "Eldorado National Forest, Cal., \$11,350;
 "Fillmore National Forest, Utah, \$18,730;
 "Fishlake National Forest, Utah, \$20,800;
 "Flathead National Forest, Mont., \$35,830;
 "Fremont National Forest, Oreg., \$29,900;
 "Gallatin National Forest, Mont., \$26,594;
 "Garces National Forest, Ariz., \$19,345;
 "Gila National Forest, N. Mex., \$47,484;
 "Gunnison National Forest, Colo., \$20,586;
 "Hayden National Forest, Wyo. and Colo., \$16,850;
 "Helena National Forest, Mont., \$34,508;
 "Holy Cross National Forest, Colo., \$18,610;
 "Humboldt National Forest, Nev., \$19,026;
 "Idaho National Forest, Idaho, \$21,780;
 "Inyo National Forest, Cal. and Nev., \$29,500;
 "Jefferson National Forest, Mont., \$34,001;
 "Jemez National Forest, N. Mex., \$31,476;
 "Kaibab National Forest, Ariz., \$20,400;
 "Kanku National Forest, Idaho and Wash., \$28,448;
 "Kansas National Forest, Kans., \$8,805;
 "Kern National Forest, Cal., \$27,512;
 "Klamath National Forest, Cal., \$42,000;
 "Kootenai National Forest, Mont., \$30,634;
 "La Sal National Forest, Utah and Colo., \$13,890;
 "Lassen National Forest, Cal., \$31,154;
 "Leadville National Forest, Colo., \$29,720;
 "Lemhi National Forest, Idaho, \$20,750;
 "Lewis and Clark National Forest, Mont., \$17,426;
 "Lincoln National Forest, N. Mex., \$20,218;
 "Lolo National Forest, Mont., \$28,952;
 "Madison National Forest, Mont., \$24,745;
 "Malheur National Forest, Oreg., \$24,063;
 "Manti National Forest, Utah, \$23,000;
 "Manzano National Forest, N. Mex., \$14,776;
 "Marquette National Forest, Mich., \$2,405;
 "Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyo., \$28,350;
 "Michigan National Forest, Mich., \$3,744;
 "Minnesota National Forest, Minn., \$24,433;
 "Minidoka National Forest, Idaho and Utah, \$17,800;
 "Missoula National Forest, Mont., \$34,504;
 "Moapa National Forest, Nev., \$3,400;
 "Modoc National Forest, Cal., \$30,890;
 "Mono National Forest, Nev. and Cal., \$23,725;
 "Monterey National Forest, Cal., \$15,070;
 "Montezuma National Forest, Colo., \$23,440;
 "Nebo National Forest, Utah, \$9,300;
 "Nebraska National Forest, Nebr., \$18,250;
 "Nevada National Forest, Nev., \$20,900;
 "Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho, \$28,507;
 "Ocala National Forest, Fla., \$5,623;
 "Olympic National Forest, Wash., \$32,925;
 "Oregon National Forest, Oreg., \$40,882;
 "Ozark National Forest, Ark., \$26,961;
 "Pallade National Forest, Idaho and Wyo., \$15,550;
 "Payette National Forest, Idaho, \$20,660;
 "Pecos National Forest, N. Mex., \$29,489;
 "Pend Oreille National Forest, Idaho, \$27,162;
 "Pike National Forest, Colo., \$41,280;
 "Plumas National Forest, Cal., \$42,012;
 "Pocatello National Forest, Idaho and Utah, \$20,246;
 "Powell National Forest, Utah, \$16,500;
 "Prescott National Forest, Ariz., \$33,851;
 "Rainier National Forest, Wash., \$36,220;
 "Rio Grande National Forest, Colo., \$26,620;
 "Routt National Forest, Colo., \$22,050;
 "Salmon National Forest, Idaho, \$29,825;
 "San Isabel National Forest, Colo., \$18,070;
 "San Juan National Forest, Colo., \$31,458;
 "Santa Barbara National Forest, Cal., \$37,889;
 "Sawtooth National Forest, Idaho, \$27,200;
 "Sequoia National Forest, Cal., \$31,512;
 "Sevier National Forest, Utah, \$20,550;
 "Shasta National Forest, Cal., \$38,675;
 "Shoshone National Forest, Wyo., \$25,220;
 "Sierra National Forest, Cal., \$49,370;
 "Sioux National Forest, S. Dak. and Mont., \$10,919;
 "Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg. and Cal., \$29,561;
 "Sitgreaves National Forest, Ariz., \$28,074;
 "Sluiclaw National Forest, Oreg., \$23,175;
 "Snoqualmie National Forest, Wash., \$30,129;
 "Sopris National Forest, Colo., \$22,058;
 "Stanislaus National Forest, Cal., \$35,788;
 "Sundance National Forest, Wyo., \$6,029;
 "Superior National Forest, Minn., \$19,379;
 "Tahoe National Forest, Cal. and Nev., \$30,886;
 "Targhee National Forest, Idaho and Wyo., \$16,850;
 "Teton National Forest, Wyo., \$22,100;
 "Toiyabe National Forest, Nev., \$24,000;
 "Tongass National Forest, Alaska, \$8,300;
 "Tonio National Forest, Ariz., \$33,111;
 "Trinity National Forest, Cal., \$36;
 "Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., \$27,214;
 "Uinta National Forest, Utah, \$28,600;
 "Umatilla National Forest, Oreg., \$17,200;
 "Umpqua National Forest, Oreg., \$36,110;
 "Uncompahgre National Forest, Colo., \$25,990;
 "Wallawa National Forest, Oreg., \$33,300;
 "Wasatch National Forest, Utah, \$23,450;
 "Washington National Forest, Wash., \$31,925;
 "Weiser National Forest, Idaho, \$22,800;

"Wenaha National Forest, Wash. and Oreg., \$19,790;
 "Wenatchee National Forest, Wash., \$32,129;
 "White River National Forest, Colo., \$19,990;
 "Whitman National Forest, Oreg., \$26,950;
 "Wichita National Forest, Okla., \$10,650;
 "Wyoming National Forest, Wyo., \$19,700; and
 "Zuni National Forest, N. Mex. and Ariz., \$19,741."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.
 The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Salaries, Division of Publications: One editor, who shall be chief of division, \$3,000; one editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,250; one chief clerk, \$2,000; one associate editor, \$2,000; four assistant editors, at \$1,600 each; two assistant editors, at \$1,400 each; one assistant in charge of indexing, \$1,800; one indexer, \$1,400; one assistant in charge of illustrations, \$2,000; one draftsman or photographer, \$1,500; two draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,400 each; six draftsmen or photographers, \$1,200 each; one assistant photographer, \$840; one assistant in charge of document section, \$2,000; one assistant in document section, \$1,600; one foreman, miscellaneous distribution, \$1,500; one foreman, farmers' bulletin distribution, \$1,200; one forewoman, \$1,400; one forewoman, \$1,200; 1 clerk, class 2; 5 clerks, class 1; ten clerks, at \$1,000 each; ten clerks, at \$900 each; twenty-five clerks, at \$840 each; thirty-two clerks, at \$720 each; one chief folder, \$1,000; one folder, \$900; three folders, at \$840 each; two skilled laborers, at \$900 each; fifteen skilled laborers, at \$840 each; fifteen skilled laborers, at \$780 each; nineteen skilled laborers, at \$720 each; two messengers, at \$840 each; four messengers, at \$720 each; three messengers, at \$600 each; two messengers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; two messengers or messenger boys, at \$420 each; two messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; two laborers, at \$660 each; one laborer, \$600; three charwomen, at \$480 each; four charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$172,730.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 19, on page 49, by striking out the words "three thousand dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three thousand five hundred dollars."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because this officer in the Agricultural Department is one of the hardest worked officers in that department. I refer to the editor of the Bureau of Publication. I submit to gentlemen on the other side that the high cost of living now is such that this officer does not get enough, and I think that his salary ought to be raised \$500. Officers of like rank in the War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Navy Department are receiving more than this man who does such valuable work for the agricultural interest of this country, and I simply want to say to the gentlemen that I am heartily in favor of raising the salary of this man.

I insist that these men in the Agricultural Department should be placed on the same footing with officers of like station in the War Department and in the Navy Department.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I can cordially indorse all the gentleman from Alabama has said in reference to the efficient gentleman who fills the position of chief of this division, but I do not think that this is the place to increase a salary, and therefore I feel obliged to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. It only raises his salary \$500.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BUTLER). The Chair would like to ask the gentleman whether this salary is fixed by the general law or is it fixed each year by the appropriation act?

Mr. SCOTT. It has always been held that a salary fixed by a current appropriation is existing law, and that an amendment offered to change it is obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman's point of order is good. I do not think this salary is fixed by separate statute, and it seems to me that it can be raised or reduced every year in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recalls that quite frequently salaries fixed in appropriation bills year after year have the force of the general law behind them. That being so, the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment, to line 21, page 49, striking out the words "two hundred and fifty" and inserting the words "five hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 21, strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred," so as to make it read "five hundred dollars."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against that as against the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. I supposed that as long as the Chair sustained the other point of order he would sustain this one. However, this man ought to have an increase in salary.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

Salaries, Bureau of Statistics: One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, \$3,500; 1 assistant statistician, who shall be assistant chief of bureau, \$2,500; 1 chief clerk, \$1,800; 6 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 12 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at \$1,300 each; 16 clerks, class 1; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$900 each; 6 clerks, at \$840 each; 10 clerks, at \$720 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 1 messenger, \$660; 1 messenger or messenger boy, \$480; 1 laborer, \$720; 1 laborer, \$660; 1 charwoman, \$540; 2 charwomen, at \$360 each; in all, \$104,700.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I find on investigation that there has been left out of the bill just at this point a very important provision, a provision which I amended when I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture, providing that the report on crop conditions shall be gathered from practical farmers. I find several lines in this provision stricken out entirely. In the outset of this bill it says that—

The following sums be, and are hereby, appropriated, out of the money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, for the purposes and objects expressly named in this bill.

Now, this object is not named in the bill, and I submit to this House that the reports on crop conditions, so far as the South is concerned, were more accurate last year and came nearer the truth than at any time in the history of the Agricultural Department or since these reports have been obtained.

I suppose it was an oversight, because some of the Members I discussed it with say that the matter was not mentioned in the committee at all, and I mentioned it to the chairman of the committee, who finally said he thought it was provided for in another law. As I understand it, each bill stands or falls upon the provisions contained in it, and unless this provision is contained in this bill I fear that it is not the law. And representing, as I do, a part of the great agricultural interests of the South, and in the name of justice to the farmers, who know more about crop conditions and who can obtain the truth more readily and more nearly than anybody—

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing). I want this provision put back.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman could be satisfied that the provision which is contained in the current agricultural appropriation act was permanent law, and therefore did not need to be included, would that satisfy him?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly; but until I am convinced of that I shall insist that the provision be put back in this bill. I have been told that—

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not the opportunity to make a speech in behalf of this provision that you hate to let go by? As a matter of fact, the law now authorizes what the gentleman is contending for.

Mr. HEFLIN. I differ with the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, because this bill expressly says in the outset that the purposes set out in this bill are appropriated for, and none other. No, sir; it was not my desire to make a speech that moved me in this matter, but I could speak and speak, if you will give me the time, every hour in the day from now until we adjourn, exposing Republican rottenness in this House and your oppression of the farmers of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is in the interest of a certainty and in the interest of fairness to the farmers that I demand that this provision go back. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not see why it was stricken out. It can not do any harm to put it back. It is the safest thing to do, and there is a question in my mind, if it is left out, whether or not it is the law.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that it has been the constant holding of the department and of the Comptroller, who is the one that finally decides on language like this, "that hereafter such and such will be the case," that this constitutes permanent law and that it is not necessary to repeat it in the appropriation bill every year?

Mr. HEFLIN. No, sir; I am not aware of the fact that that is the custom or the holding of the department.

Mr. MANN. Is not the gentleman satisfied with his victory of last year—

Mr. HEFLIN. I am; but it takes eternal vigilance here to hold a victory. I want to be sure.

Mr. MANN (continuing). In inserting this provision as permanent law rather than as in a mere appropriation bill?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am, if it is permanent. I wanted to be sure of that.

Mr. MANN. It is permanent law and can not be considered otherwise.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, I wanted the House and the country to have full knowledge of the fact that the provision is not contained in this bill. I hope the gentleman from Illinois is right

and that it will be held to be the law, and I value the gentleman's opinion. I have done my duty in regard to the matter.

Mr. MANN. To insert it year by year in the appropriation act might be taken as an intention of Congress to construe it as not permanent law, and would weaken the effect of the gentleman's amendment of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I move to strike out the last word.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was merely my purpose to raise this important question, and I did it in good faith. I discovered it was left out of the bill. I then mentioned it to every Democrat on the committee, and all of them said that it was never called to their attention. I mentioned it to one Republican, and he said it was never mentioned; and I wanted the House to know that it had been omitted from the bill. I am glad to have the expression of gentlemen that it is their belief that it is the law. I wanted to enter my protest against its being stricken out, so that if anything should happen hereafter the country should know that I was attending to my duty and looking after the interests of the farmer.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from Alabama is probably the only Member of the House who is not aware that when the word "hereafter" is applied to any provision in an appropriation bill it has always been construed as making it permanent law. This proviso appeared in the current law in this form:

Provided, That hereafter monthly crop reports, which shall be gathered as far as possible from practical farmers, and which shall be issued about the 10th of each month—

And so forth.

That language was repeated in the estimates this year, but it was inclosed in heavy brackets, showing that the department believed that it was no longer necessary to include it in the appropriation bill. It was therefore laid before every member of the committee, and none of us had any doubt, in view of the fact that it contained the word "hereafter," that it was and is permanent law.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to ask the gentleman, then, how he disposes of the language in the bill now under consideration—

That for the purposes and objects hereinafter expressly named in this law?

Mr. MANN. That is the appropriation.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is the appropriation for objects named in this law right here. I want to say further to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott] that I discussed this matter with the Democratic members of that committee and that they replied that it was never called to their attention at all, and one Republican said the same thing.

Mr. SCOTT. This proviso simply directs the Secretary how and in what manner the information shall be collected and distributed. The language which the gentleman quotes refers only to the money to be appropriated. The money is appropriated for carrying this provision into effect. The proviso refers to the manner in which it should be used. I will assure the gentleman he need have no uneasiness about it, and if he does not withdraw his amendment I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. JAMES. Was it put in the appropriation bill last year by unanimous consent?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly; it never could have been done except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JAMES. Well, was the original proviso that you say was passed last year, and which you say is law, put in the bill by unanimous consent?

Mr. SCOTT. If any point of order had been made against it, it would have gone out. Do I understand the gentleman from Alabama to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the assurances that I have from the chairman of the committee and other gentlemen that this proviso will be continued, I withdraw the amendment. I either wanted the provision put back in the bill or the assurance that it is accepted as the law as I amended it last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Statistics: For all necessary expenses for collecting domestic and foreign agricultural statistics, compiling, writing, and illustrating statistical matter for monthly, annual, and special reports, and for special investigations and compilations, as follows.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask about a provision that has already been read, but I was not here when it was disposed of. I was curious to ask the chairman of the committee something about the status of the provision on page 46 of \$300,000 on account of the "continued spread of the gypsy moth." That is a provision that we have had for quite a number of years, I think. Now,

I would like to ask the chairman what progress, if any, we are making in this respect? Is the spread checked or is this moth still extending its operations, that we should have so large an appropriation?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. L. O. Howard, the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, who has charge of this work, made quite an encouraging report to the committee this year. He stated that the geographical area infested by the gypsy moth had not extended, except to a small degree in a northerly direction. The department has not attempted to limit the moth on the north, because it believes climatic conditions will prevent its destructive spread very far in that direction.

It has been endeavoring, with a great deal of success, to quarantine the pest; that is, to hold it, as far as possible, within its original limits. It has succeeded very well in doing that, and has cleared out a great many sections of forest so completely that the moth is no longer doing any injury there.

The bureau has also been very successful in the introduction of parasites, and it is from these natural enemies of the moth that its ultimate control is expected. Parasites have been imported from Japan and from Europe, and 35 or 40 different species have been acclimatized in this country. During the past summer parasites were found quite thickly spread over an area of about 500 square miles, where they were causing a very considerable mortality of the moth. One or two varieties of parasites have been introduced that attack not only the gypsy moth, but the brown-tail moth also, so that, on the whole, the department reports very gratifying progress in the work.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there any reason to suppose, or does anyone claim, that through these appropriations this gypsy moth will finally be exterminated where its ravages have already begun, or do you do anything more than endeavor to prevent its spread?

Mr. SCOTT. They exterminate it so far as the funds at their disposal will permit. The eggs of the moth are laid in such a way that they are easily discovered and a large number of men are constantly employed to destroy them. But it is believed that the ultimate control of the moth must come from the work of its natural enemies.

Mr. PERKINS. How many years have these appropriations been made?

Mr. SCOTT. I think it was four years ago that we began with \$82,500. The next year we raised it to \$150,000, the third year to \$250,000, and the current year to \$300,000.

Mr. PERKINS. So far as the natural enemies go, they are furnished by nature, are they not, whether this appropriation is made or not?

Mr. SCOTT. There were no natural enemies indigenous to this country, for the reason that the moth itself was a foreigner. It happened to get in without bringing any of its parasites along with it, so that a part of this appropriation has been used to send men to Japan and Europe, where the moth came from, and find the parasites which preyed upon it.

Mr. PERKINS. That is, the department has brought over the parasites?

Mr. SCOTT. In very great numbers.

Mr. PERKINS. They have been imported artificially and did not come of their own accord.

Mr. SCOTT. They have been imported by the department, and with very fair success.

Mr. MANN. The main purpose of this is to give further illustration to the old adage that hope springs eternal in the human breast. As long as we make these appropriations we hope that we may discover a method of doing away with these moths, and meanwhile something may come along and really end the trouble.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, \$99,000, as follows: Alaska, \$28,000; Hawaii, \$28,000; Porto Rico, \$28,000; and Guam, \$15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, and to apply the money received from the sale of such products to the maintenance of said stations, and this fund shall be available until used.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. I believe this is the same as the item in the current law. It provides for the erection of buildings, and so forth, and also for the sale of the product, the money to be used toward the maintenance of the station, which is always a bad provision. But what are the facts in regard to these stations? Do they want new buildings, and do they have any products which they sell; and if so, what are the amounts of the sales?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the buildings, with the exception of Guam, where I think a house of moderate cost has been or is to be built for the use of the director, no buildings are erected except the small temporary structures that may be necessary in the current work of the station. I am not able to answer the gentleman's inquiry as to the amount of products sold at the various stations. In a general way, we can all agree with him that it is bad legislation to provide for a revolving fund of this sort; and yet there seems to be hardly any other way to handle the business in Alaska, or in Hawaii, or in Porto Rico, because a very large part of the products are perishable, and unless they were sold on the ground the value of them would be entirely lost.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to selling the products. I do not see what else they could do with them.

Mr. SCOTT. In the case of other experiment stations in the various States we make an appropriation from the Federal Treasury in support of these stations, and we do not require them to turn back to the Treasury the funds which they may obtain from the sale of the products they raise. In order to put other stations in our outlying possessions upon an equal footing with the state stations, this provision has been inserted.

Mr. MANN. This is a good deal like fancy farming. A man in the city owns a farm in the country, which he expects to support, and yet it seems we ought to have some statement about what we produce in these places and what it amounts to.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the reports of the directors of the various stations contain the information which the gentleman inquires for, but the reports were not made a part of the hearings before the committee.

Mr. MANN. I am sure I do not know, but I have read with interest all the publications that I have seen issued on the subject, but I have not noticed that any of them contain that information. We are spending \$28,000 in Alaska. It is desirable to see if we can raise things up there and see what we can raise. But I am curious to know whether we spend \$28,000 year after year in order to produce a thousand dollars' worth of some kind of green vegetables. Of course anybody in Alaska could farm on that basis if that be the case.

Mr. SCOTT. As a result of the experiments made in Alaska a very lucrative business has been built up by private enterprise in truck gardening. The gentleman would perhaps be surprised, as I was, to learn that in the neighborhood of Fairbanks there are a great many vegetables which can be grown to maturity, and that that city is to a considerable extent supplied with fresh vegetables from truck farms that lie near it.

Mr. MANN. I am not surprised at that at all. There are many vegetables that grow very rapidly, and it does not take but a few weeks to grow them here. There, where the sun shines for nearly twenty-four hours a day, they grow very rapidly.

Mr. SCOTT. But the attempt to grow them was not made until it was demonstrated by our experiment station that it could be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nutrition investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the nutritive value of agricultural products used for human food, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for this purpose, with the cooperation of other bureaus of the department, and to disseminate useful information on this subject, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$10,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether under this provision there is now defrayed the expenses of what we used to call the "poison squad," that was fed on deleterious food to see what happened to them.

Mr. SCOTT. The work done under this provision has no relation to what was called the "poison squad."

Mr. MANN. I want to say that the poison squad was cut out, and it has been one of the greatest detriments that ever happened to this bill. I do not know but that it was the gentleman from New York that made the point of order; I think it was the gentleman from Georgia that cut out the provision for the poison squad, that was worth millions of dollars to the public if it had been kept in.

Mr. PERKINS. I hope that I made the point of order, for if there ever was a provision discredited by men in every walk of life it was that provision for the poison squad.

Mr. MANN. If there ever was an instance of the strenuous influence of the so-called "interests" to accomplish through so-called "scientific methods," in order to overthrow demonstrative facts which were demonstrated under the poison-squad provision, it was in the cutting out of this provision.

Mr. PERKINS. Why does the gentleman say "so-called scientific methods," when the most eminent chemists in the country were called in? Is it because their report was unfavorable to Doctor Wiley?

Mr. MANN. It was not, so far as I am concerned, because the report was unfavorable to Doctor Wiley, although I have a great deal of confidence in Doctor Wiley. I have witnessed expert testimony and the results of expert testimony ever since I commenced to practice law at the bar some years ago. I have just as much confidence in the average expert testimony of a lawyer who testifies as to the value of legal services, or a doctor who testifies in reference to some medical proposition where he is employed to testify one way, as I have in the testimony and opinions given by these eminent chemists who made these examinations.

Mr. PERKINS. By whom was the board of review, appointed by the President of the United States, employed? Wherein would the interests have an opportunity to employ them as experts?

Mr. MANN. That is one thing I have been trying to ascertain—by whom they were employed.

Mr. PERKINS. They were appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the physicians of the State of New York evidently indorsed the work of Doctor Wiley, if we are to believe the newspaper accounts. I noticed a few days ago that the medical association of that State had indorsed the work of Doctor Wiley and had tabooed benzoate of soda.

Mr. MANN. And, Mr. Chairman, the very fact that such a distinguished Member of this House, for whom I have great admiration and in whose judgment I have great confidence, is afraid to have a government official proceed with an investigation designed to ascertain facts, shows that the gentlemen are afraid. I never objected to the special board; was perfectly willing that the special board should continue to acquire information, all that it desires. I have no doubt it acquired valuable information, although I do not agree with their conclusions; but that is not an important fact at all. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] and other gentlemen who have been afraid of the final conclusion of the country in reference to the use of preservatives object to the department obtaining information which the people want and which the people ought to have.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any question of fear in the matter at all. The only position taken by some has been that omniscience is not always found even in a government employee. When other experts in chemistry may make mistakes, it is possible that even Doctor Wiley may sometimes be wrong; and when it was demanded that if the head of a bureau had issued his edict in reference to any article of food, no one else in the country, no board of chemists, however eminent or disinterested, should pass upon it, or if they did pass upon it, that they must necessarily be regarded, as the gentleman from Illinois says, as emissaries and purchased agents of great interests, then that is a proposition as to which I can not agree with my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think in this matter of preservatives, eminent gentlemen having decided on both sides of the question, it would be only fair to give the people of the United States the benefit of the doubt?

Mr. PERKINS. What does the gentleman mean by "the benefit of the doubt?"

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. If there is some question as to whether this preservative is poison, does the gentleman not think that the people ought to have the benefit of the doubt?

Mr. PERKINS. When the people of the United States have eaten this in the small quantities in which it is necessary for generations, and the race is still in the condition of vigor that it is, I do not think it is necessary to give the benefit of the doubt to any man who says that it never shall be used in the future.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are two answers to the last proposition. In the first place, the race has not taken preservatives in this way for generations, and not for very many years.

Mr. PERKINS. A good many years.

Mr. MANN. Not even during the lifetime of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PERKINS. That covers more than a generation.

Mr. MANN. In the second place, there are a great many people in this country now who are suffering in health from the effect of the preservatives that they have taken in their foods unknown to themselves.

Mr. LEVER. And that fact is testified to by almost every scientist except the Remson board.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Irrigation investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws of the States and Territories as affecting irrigation and the rights of appropriators, and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation, and upon the use of irrigation waters, at home and abroad, with especial suggestions of the best methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture, and upon the use of different kinds of power and appliances for irrigation, and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all necessary expenses, \$70,380.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "seventy," in line 12, page 59, and insert in lieu thereof the word "ninety-five."

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to increase the appropriation for irrigation investigations \$25,000. When this bill was first reported to the House and general debate was entered upon, I gave notice in the fifteen minutes allotted to me that I would offer this amendment, and stated my reasons why. For the benefit of those who were not present at that time, I will state that I desire this amendment adopted for the purpose of allowing more money for irrigation investigations and experiments in the humid regions east of the one hundredth meridian. Last year there were \$75,000 appropriated for irrigation experiments generally. This year it is cut down to \$70,380. Last year \$3,000 of that amount was used in the humid regions and good results were obtained. Experiments are being carried on in quite a number of States—in Florida, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and I understand some experiments have been made in New Jersey and some in Missouri.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. CRAIG. With pleasure.

Mr. SCOTT. To whom are these experts to whom the gentleman refers making reports?

Mr. CRAIG. I get a good deal of information from Mr. Milo B. Williams, the engineer in charge of this work in the humid regions, and men employed under his direction.

Mr. SCOTT. Is that done at the expense of the Government or State or individual?

Mr. CRAIG. Why, in a great many instances the State co-operates with the Government; in other instances, as for instance in Alabama, an individual is cooperating with the Government.

Mr. SCOTT. But the experiments are initiated by the Government?

Mr. CRAIG. I do not think they have been initiated by the Government. I asked them to come down—I might say that I initiated the one in Alabama, in part.

Mr. SCOTT. At any rate, they are all participated in to some degree by the Government?

Mr. CRAIG. That is my information, that they are all participated in to some degree, and to how small a degree the House will readily realize when I state I was informed by the man at the head of this work, who directed the experiment in my district, that he had allotted more money to the experiments in my district than he had to any other; he had allotted \$100 to the man in my district, so you can imagine the vast extent to which the Government has participated in these experiments. Last year the cotton crop of Alabama amounted to 1,263,953 bales. This year, almost solely on account of the drought which came the latter part of August and lasted through September and up through part of October, the cotton crop was reduced to 987,254 bales, nearly 300,000 bales of cotton less. At \$80 a bale it is very easy to see the immense loss that was occasioned in this one industry in one State by reason of not being able to supplement the rainfall. It might seem a little new to some persons to speak of irrigation in a country where there is ordinarily a good rainfall; but it will not seem unusual or in any degree strange when I tell you that in some years in the humid regions we have nearly all the rainfall in the first few months of the spring; and very often in the latter part of the summer, when the crops are really being made and need the most moisture, they get absolutely none and it occasions great loss. The loss which was occasioned this crop year was by reason of just such conditions.

Now, the farmers in the southern part of the humid region, and as I understand in other parts of the humid region, are taking a great deal of interest in the matter and they want to know something about irrigation. There is appropriated by this bill for the investigation of dry-land farming \$31,730, investigation of reclamation lands \$74,380, and the amount to be expended under this paragraph in the West, figuring the same proportion as expended in the humid regions last year and adding \$500 thereto, is \$66,880, making a total of \$172,990 for irrigation experiments and investigations, or investigations of that nature, in the arid and semiarid regions. It is not at all unreasonable for the humid region to ask and to receive at least \$30,000 in order that the farmers may have some instruction in how to supplement the rainfall, which is at times very scarce. Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama what is the average rainfall in his section of the State? I refer to the annual rainfall.

Mr. CRAIG. Why, for the last twenty years I should say something like 50 to 55 inches.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The average annual rainfall?

Mr. CRAIG. I get that from the report just compiled. I think it includes all the years from the time the bureau was established up to now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to observe that, in my opinion, the purpose of these irrigation schemes was to inquire as to how they might make crops on land in the arid and semiarid regions, and it seems to me your proposition is drainage rather than irrigation.

Mr. CRAIG. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I will.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. While your rainfall is at times large, as I understood you the other day, you had a drought in Alabama for some months.

Mr. CRAIG. Most assuredly; and that drought cost us 300,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. And that drought reduced your crop by some 300,000 bales.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. And that drought extended all through the East—up into Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, clear to New York.

Mr. CRAIG. It did; and the farmers of New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia suffered like our farmers did.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is undoubtedly true that occasionally we have droughts in this country, but if we proceed on the idea of developing irrigation projects in all sections of this country, where they occasionally have droughts, it strikes me we will bankrupt the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Are not these investigations and experiments also for the benefit of the truck farmer as well as the cotton farmer?

Mr. CRAIG. They are more used by the truck farmers than they are by the cotton farmers. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if the Republican party is looking for a way to cheapen food in this country and they do not want to cut down the tariff in order to do it, which they seem averse to doing, the best thing in the world they can do is to insure by irrigation in the humid regions the truck crops that are grown east of the one hundredth meridian.

Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] makes an assertion about irrigation in the humid regions that he would not make if he knew the facts. The gentleman possibly does not know that in the Alpine region of Europe, where there is more humidity than there is in any other part of the whole Continent, there is more irrigation going on to-day, and has been for years, than there is in any other part of Europe. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district a portion of which does not enjoy the luxury of a rainfall as great

as the locality represented by the gentleman who has just spoken, but one in which the question of irrigation is a very important and very practical one. A portion of the district I represent is in what is known as the "semiarid region," the rainfall being about 20 inches per annum, and it is necessary to supplement the rainfall with irrigation, and there is more or less of irrigation in that section of the country.

I understand that the appropriation last year for this work was \$75,000. I can not understand why it should have been decreased, and I think that the work is of such importance that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama ought to prevail. [Applause.]

I want to call your attention to this fact, gentlemen: This Government is building irrigation plants all over the West, and you are inviting people to come out and take land under those plants, many of whom know no more about irrigation than they know about the Koran. As a consequence, many people are making failures and are having to give up their claims because of the fact that they do not understand how to use water in irrigation. You have established a magnificent pumping plant at Garden City, and there is a difficulty existing at the present time between the water-users' association and the Government, arising to some degree because of the fact that those people, even in that region where they have been in contact with irrigation, more or less, and have used it to a greater or less extent for years, have not yet fully learned the art of irrigation.

Every man here who comes from an irrigated section understands that men have to be educated in order to effectively use water for the purposes of irrigation. We ought not to invite people to go out and take land under these projects that we are establishing without providing some adequate means to educate, or, at least, to assist them in the matter of education in irrigation. It is a province which the Government may well enter upon. It is akin to many other plans and projects that the Government has entered upon to assist the American people, and as this is so intimately connected with work that the Government is doing in the matter of the reclamation of arid lands, we ought to unquestionably do what we can to assist the people to learn how to irrigate their lands. I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG] will prevail. I believe that the suggestion he has made may well be considered by this House; and in the West, where irrigation is a vital problem, we feel there should be no decrease in this appropriation, but, instead of that, we ought to increase it.

Doctor Fortier, who has charge of these irrigation investigations, is doing a magnificent work. He has a very efficient man at work in my district, one of those bright and active young fellows who are engaged in the government service who are endeavoring to do something practical, something of value for the people, but he is unable to accomplish much because of the limited funds that are given him. I believe this meager appropriation of \$70,000 is so small that it is of very little practical benefit. It means that you scatter these dollars over too vast a surface. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG], who offers this amendment, will realize that the situation in the arid and semiarid West is such as to call for a very much larger expenditure there for investigation for irrigation purposes than is necessary in the humid East and South—

Mr. CRAIG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SCOTT (continuing). In some parts of the West farming depends entirely upon the question of irrigation. The farmers there would not be able to make a living at all unless they could irrigate their lands; and the question as to whether a certain area shall be populated or not depends entirely upon the development of irrigation. But in the South and in the eastern portion of the country the principal crops can be grown without irrigation. It is only in intensified farming in the East, and in rice farming in the South, that irrigation is practiced or would be practiced in the humid regions of the country. Obviously, it would not be economy for the ordinary farmer to maintain a system of irrigation which he might need only once in three or four years.

Mr. CRAIG. Does the gentleman state that the irrigation systems in Europe which were established in the thirteenth century, and previous to that, have been maintained at a loss?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly not; but the conditions there are entirely different.

Mr. CRAIG. Are not they in humid regions?

Mr. SCOTT. I say the conditions there are entirely different.

Mr. CRAIG. What is the difference?

Mr. SCOTT. The difference is in the density of population. The situation to which the gentleman refers only confirms the

remark I have just made—that irrigation in humid regions is of value only in extremely intensified farming. That is the reason it is needed in Europe, because intensified farming must be practiced if the population is to be supported. That condition does not yet exist in the United States; and, therefore, I hold that all that the Federal Government can properly do is to carry on experiments here and there to bring out such facts as will be of benefit to the comparatively few people who might make use of the methods developed. The gentleman has stated in reply to my questions that the Government is now participating in a number of experiments carried on in Louisiana and some half dozen other States that he named. I find, from the report of the drainage office, that \$3,500 was expended in that way.

Mr. CRAIG. I think the gentleman is in error. There was not \$3,500 expended in that work this year.

Mr. SCOTT. Perhaps the amount allotted for this year is only \$3,000. The gentleman may be right about that.

Mr. CRAIG. I am correct about it.

Mr. SCOTT. But the estimate is \$3,500 for this year; they are going to expend \$500 more than last year. And they expect to expend in addition \$2,000 in connection with rice-irrigation work. The fact that the department itself has not estimated for any increase would seem to warrant the committee in reporting the bill in its present shape.

As to the suggestion of my friend from Kansas in relation to the decrease of this appropriation, I wish to state that it is in appearance only, and not in fact. There is an apparent decrease of \$4,200, but of this \$3,720 is to be transferred to the statutory rolls of the bureau for the payment of employees who hitherto have been paid out of lump sums, and \$900 is accounted for by the transfer of one carpenter to the Secretary's roll in pursuance of the plan of concentrating the mechanical force, to which I alluded in my opening statement. So that there will be precisely as much money for this purpose next year as is being expended during the current year. But this is not all the money that will be available for irrigation work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Is the amount carried in the bill the amount of the estimate?

Mr. SCOTT. Precisely.

I just remarked that the amount carried in this paragraph is not all the money that is available for irrigation work in this bill. The gentleman from Kansas very appropriately spoke of the importance of the irrigation work in our great reclamation projects in the West. But we provide, under the Bureau of Plant Industry, for investigations in connection with the utilization of land reclaimed under the reclamation act, an appropriation of \$74,300. So that, as a matter of fact, something more than \$100,000 is available for substantially the same purpose as is provided for in this paragraph.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. MADISON. That language you just read differed from this, which is contained in the section under discussion:

With especial suggestions of the best methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture.

Does the gentleman say—and I am asking for information—that the same work will be done in the government irrigation projects as will be done under the provisions of this section?

Mr. SCOTT. The "best methods" which the language of this paragraph seeks to develop are the improvements that are hoped to be developed from experiments; and I take it that the experiments conducted in reclamation projects certainly will contribute a great deal to the information of the officials of this office.

Mr. MADISON. Is it not true that that which the gentleman just read refers to plant discovery, the kind of plants that can be best grown there, rather than the use of the water in irrigation?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not see very well how they could develop a reclamation project without at the same time discovering the best methods of using the water. It seems to me that the work carried on with a view to developing the reclamation projects must contribute directly and materially to the fund of information which the investigation provided for under this paragraph is designed to acquire.

But let me say further, in closing, that this work has not just begun, and it will not end with this year. It has been carried on for a great many years, and an immense amount of information has been collected, which is now available for

anybody who is going into the arid regions with the expectation of farming through irrigation. Bulletins have been published and books have been prepared; letters can be written in response to inquiries as a result of the investigations and experiments that have been carried on in former years; so that a man going onto an arid or semiarid farm is not left helpless because there is not enough money appropriated in this particular bill to send somebody to sit down alongside of him and show him what to do. He can obtain all the information he is likely to be able to use by applying to the department. There has been no estimate for an increase in this appropriation, and I do not believe an increase is needed in the interests of the country, either East or West. I trust, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be voted down.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret to advise or suggest increases of appropriations above the amounts asked by the department, but I realize that in considering this bill we must take into consideration the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, like the other Secretaries, was informed that the estimates should be kept as low as possible, and that therefore in some instances the estimates did not include all that the department might advantageously use in carrying on its work.

The work carried on heretofore and that contemplated under this paragraph is exceedingly important. Part of the work contemplated and provided for in the paragraph has largely been accomplished, and in no department of investigation have we had more valuable and effective work than under this appropriation in the study of the irrigation methods of the various countries in which irrigation is carried on, in studying the irrigation laws, institutions, and methods of foreign countries in which irrigation is carried on, and of the various States of the Union, and in encouraging the legislation which has been had in the past few years amendatory of the irrigation statutes of the various States.

I have in mind no appropriation that has led to greater improvement, or that has conferred greater benefit in any field than the portion of this appropriation used for the purposes to which I have referred.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be glad to.

Mr. SCOTT. Does it not occur to the gentleman that the very fact he has stated, the tribute he has paid to the excellent work that has been accomplished by this bureau, should argue that it has been doing very well with the money we have given it, and therefore does not need to have its present appropriation increased 25 or 30 per cent?

Mr. MONDELL. That is true in a certain limited sense; but I was going on to say that while that field has been fairly well covered in the past, there is still much to do in it. We need still further study in that direction, but the major portion of this appropriation is not now used for that class of work. It is used for the purpose of studying irrigation conditions throughout the country; in advising beginners under irrigation as to the best methods to be practiced, and in conducting experiments to demonstrate the most economical and most advantageous way of using water in irrigation. The appropriation to which the chairman refers has to do entirely with the government reclamation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that debate close in five minutes on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. CRAIG. I ask that it be fifteen minutes. There are one or two other gentlemen who want to be heard.

Mr. SCOTT. I will modify my request, and ask that debate on the paragraph and all amendments close in fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the item to which the chairman refers is an appropriation for experimental work on Government irrigation projects, and it is used for the purpose of conducting experimental farms. That work is a valuable and important work. It is a practical work, but it applies only to the lands covered by the government reclamation projects, and in many Western States there is but one such government project while there may be thousands of private irrigation enterprises.

The one government project may occupy territory entirely different from that occupied by a great majority of the private projects. Conditions vary vastly as to water supply, as to the character of the land, as to the slope of the territory irrigated, as to the character of crops that can be profitably grown. So that these practical demonstrations and experiments on the government reclamation projects, while valuable, do not cover

the entire field, whereas the work carried on under this appropriation is carried on generally throughout the entire country where irrigation is practiced. It is carried on both in a practical way and in a scientific way. It covers the entire field of irrigation law and of irrigation policy and of irrigation practice. It is helpful in the rice fields of the South, it is useful in the intensified farming that is being carried on under irrigation in the East, and which, in my opinion, will increase vastly in the future. It is useful throughout the entire western country where work is carried on by practical demonstration, by investigation and study, and by the preparation and publication of pamphlets and reports, which are widely read and which are exceedingly useful, informing newcomers as to the proper methods of irrigation and encouraging those long engaged in that form of agriculture in improving their methods.

I have no question but that had the Secretary felt that he was at liberty to increase any of the items in the bill above the amount used last year, he would have felt that this was one of the items that ought to be increased.

I know something of the work carried on under this appropriation. I believe they need more money for the economical extension and development of the valuable and important and useful work which they have undertaken. I desire, in closing, to call attention to the fact that we have given only a little more for this work, scattered throughout the entire United States, from Louisiana and Alabama to New Jersey and California, than we have given for the patrolling of a couple of the forest reserves in the West. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should not be some increase in this appropriation. This appropriation is used in the investigation of irrigation throughout the arid and semiarid lands of the West and also a very small amount in the humid regions of the South and East. I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG] stated only about \$3,000 of the whole amount was available last year for experiments and investigations with reference to the irrigation of the humid lands in the South and East.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has been very successful with this bill. I do not believe the bill has been amended at all. I do not recall any amendment, but I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] when he says if the Secretary of Agriculture had felt that he could have made any recommendation for any increase of appropriation, in view of the Treasury deficit, he probably would have made it for this appropriation. The gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, says that the work has just been begun, and that is true; but because it has been such valuable work those who are interested in the humid regions of the South and East would like to see the work extended and continued. It is valuable in periods of drought not only to the cotton farmer, but especially valuable to the truck farmer. We are interested in my immediate section of the country in truck lands and their proper irrigation. I have seen lands worth only \$5 an acre increase in value in eastern North Carolina to \$100, \$200, and \$300 per acre by reason of the development of truck and intensified farming.

We are beginning to experiment in our own way in irrigating our truck crops, but there is a great deal of useful information which might still be disseminated among the cotton and truck farmers of the South in order to show them the best methods of irrigating their lands, both the cotton and the truck lands. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD some remarks made by a constituent of mine, Hon. J. N. Whitner, of Sanford, Fla., delivered at the horticultural convention held at Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the subject of subirrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The remarks are as follows:

When God made man He made him a horticulturist and put him to dress the Garden of Eden, and the happiness and perhaps the very existence of the race has depended since then upon the tilling of the soil. The failure to produce crops resulted in famine. Crop failures were for want of irrigation to supply failure of rainfall. Until recent years man has, in the main, been content to trust the seasons for "the early and the later rain" to supply the moisture every crop requires.

THE SANFORD SYSTEM.

Civilized man, with rapidly increasing millions to feed, with intensive farming, which makes it necessary to obtain the most and best from his ground, has turned to irrigation. We are amazed at what has been and is being done by private, as well as government, enterprise. And as this great national convention and exhibition is assembled to tell and show what great things have been and can be done, the far

South, even Florida, sends you greeting and bids me claim fellowship and a part in your labors. We have brought some of our products to show you, and I am sent to tell you of our system of irrigation and some of its results. We know it as the "Sanford system of subirrigation and drainage."

Let me describe the system, its operation, and theory; then, with your permission, tell you something of what it has done for us. Its possibilities seem limitless. Without an illustration or drawing a description is difficult to understand or remember. I have, therefore, brought a sufficient number of illustrations, a glance at which will give a full understanding. These are for free distribution at the Florida booth, or will be mailed upon request. Briefly stated, the water is applied through 3-inch tile, laid in parallel ditches 18 inches deep, with a fall of not less than 1 inch to the 100 feet. The distance between the rows of tile varies according to quality of soil; in our sandy loam 25 feet affords effective drainage, as well as irrigation. The more clay and the stiffer the soil the nearer they should be placed. At the upper end of the tile, beginning at the water supply (with us flowing or artesian wells), and running by the end of each row of tile, is a water main, the cheapest being small sewer pipe cemented at the joints. Between the tile and this water main a joint of 6-inch sewer pipe is used as a stand pipe, connected by a short iron pipe on one side with the main, while on the other is the connection with the tile. It will readily be seen that water turned into the water main and running by each of the standpipes can be turned into as few or as many as desired, in this way irrigating all or any portion of the field. Of course the tile is in short joints—with us 1 foot in length—and the water finds ingress or egress at the joints, porous tile being largely a myth. At the lower side of the field the tile discharges into a waste ditch, and when the ground is level and the flow of water not too rapid it will be found that capillary attraction supplies all the moisture needed, even for setting plants; but most fields are equipped with stop boxes at the lower end of tile, and when ground is much broken these boxes are placed at intervals, as required, and the illustration shows how the water is dammed up to any level required, even to flooding the ground.

IRRIGATION AND DRAINS.

This much for irrigation. It is quite as effective for drainage, being laid on an incline and water applied by gravity. In case of rain the excess is taken off very quickly, and on our soil if it rains 3 inches to-day we can plow to-morrow. This we find is of inestimable value, for with the soil saturated with water, as the small boy would say, there is nothing doing, or, as one of our western farmers put it, "You can't get no action out of the ground." The reason of this inertia, as you all know, is that the water excludes the air from the ground. Now, with surface irrigation and without this subdrainage you have to wait for the water to evaporate, which, slowly drying from the surface, inch by inch, lets in a little air from above, while the plants await the life-giving air. With our system, as soon as the water stops running the tile becomes a conveyor of air, which is supplied, so to speak, from both top and bottom. Our system not only does these things, but furnishes warmth from below, and as warm air rises from the tile it has a marked influence on the growing crop, especially in winter, when our most profitable crops are grown, for with us September or October are seed time and February and March the harvest. You can understand that it matters little to us whether it rains or not, for during the winter of 1906 it rained frequently and in torrents, while the next year we had not a single rain from September 15 to April 5, yet raised equally as good and profitable crops. So rain is not necessary to plant, grow, or perfect a crop.

CELERY OR LETTUCE.

As yet our principal crops are celery and lettuce for the northern markets. And I quote from the state department of agriculture for the crop of 1907-8, volume 8, page 129, as follows:

Lettuce, 139 acres, 97,180 crates, \$132,587, or \$953.86 per acre.
Celery, 209 acres, 209,185 crates, \$402,300, or \$1,924.88 per acre.
Total, \$2,878.74 per acre.

I have not seen the report for 1908-9, but the results were certainly as good. These figures, 1907-8, do not mean two years, but one, running from November of one year to June of the next, that being one crop season. Now, with your kind indulgence, I want to tell you a few of the things we have accomplished by this unique and wonderful system of irrigation. In the spring of 1898 I had the honor to ship the first carloads of celery from Sanford, this being the first year we used subirrigation, and the first carload of produce of any kind following the freeze of 1895, which destroyed our orange groves, valued at \$100,000. The past season from this one point we shipped 1,700 carloads, exclusive of express shipments, making in all close to 2,000 carloads, the estimated income of same being \$600,000 from approximately 800 acres of land. It is certain that one brokerage firm, Chase & Co., paid the growers \$275,000 for the portion of the crop they handled. We have one grower, C. F. Williams, who sold from measured 5 acres in celery \$30,680 in three consecutive years. L. A. Brumley brought 1½ acres, with crop on it, in March, 1908, and in fourteen months sold \$5,000 worth of celery and lettuce from the 1½ acres. T. V. Denton, a New York commission man, told me that last season he paid Mr. Allison \$1,200 for the lettuce on 1 acre, which was then planted in celery, for which he paid him \$1,800, making \$3,000 the past season from 1 acre. Is it any wonder, then, that we estimate a revenue to railroads of \$700 per acre on our subirrigated farms? And if you will add \$700 to the above known yields and tell me what our subirrigated lands are worth, figured on an interest-bearing basis, I will thank you.

VALUE OF LANDS.

As to the value of these lands, ten years ago, before subirrigation was adopted, 1,000 acres of these Sanford celery delta lands were sold for 25 cents an acre. That fall, just ten years ago, H. H. Chappell, being fortunate enough, by the sale of the railroad he was working for, to lose his position, began farming on this then new plan of subirrigated lands, practically without means. On the 25th of October just past he bought 35 acres of subirrigated lands, just across the road from his farm where he made the money, and paid \$35,000 for it. He paid in addition for the labor and fertilizer already expended for his season's crop, making the purchase price \$40,000 for 35 acres, this 35 acres being a part of the land sold at 25 cents ten years ago. Please note this was no land boomer's sale to a stranger.

This is what has been done in ten years by a people made destitute by the freeze, and most of it in five years. With more brains—and I do not say better brains—more brawn, and, lastly, more money, what the future holds for us requires a more vivid imagination than mine to predict. Now, gentlemen, I invite you to come to Florida; and if you

do, come to Sanford and see our irrigated fields and their products, and if I fail to satisfy the most skeptical of the accuracy of every statement I have made, I will pay your expenses for the entire trip. I thank you for your attention.

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the proposed amendment should not be adopted, for the following reasons: First, that many of the irrigation projects are already provided with lands and buildings necessary for these experiments, and this makes the expense of conducting these experiments very much less on the Agricultural Department. That is, out of the national irrigation fund these provisions are made on most of these government irrigation projects, so that a great portion of the expense necessary for teaching people how to irrigate is made from the regular irrigation funds.

Mr. SCOTT. But the work is done just the same.

Mr. REEDER. Certainly; but it requires less expense than if the work had to be done and the building and lands furnished.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman means that \$70,000 appropriated for that purpose will do a great deal more work.

Mr. REEDER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. REEDER. Not until I finish the statement I am making. I want to repeat, that on all the government projects many men are already located who know how to irrigate, and who become instructors to a large extent of the new settlers. Then the information that is gained each year on each one of these projects reaches into the future, so that very much information has been already accumulated; hence it does not seem to me advisable to increase this fund, for these reasons, but the most important reason is that I do not like to have us fall into the habit of giving the departments more than they ask. I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I judge from the gentleman's remarks that he evidently thinks this appropriation was used partially at least on the government irrigation projects.

Mr. REEDER. I so understand.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not so understand it.

Mr. REEDER. These experiments are made by the Agricultural Department, and the reclamation fund furnishes the buildings and the land, and the present Secretary of the Interior desires us to put the power of establishing these stations into an explicit law, thinking it is not now provided for in the law as it stands.

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman understands there is another item that carries the appropriation for these projects and this is the general item that relates to the country as a whole.

Mr. REEDER. Yes; and to the irrigation projects as well. The Agricultural Department uses this money, as I understand it, for the purpose of instructing on the reclamation projects, as well as those outside of reclamation projects.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that, then, an argument for increasing it, because we do not have even this amount for the general work?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will pardon me, I think he is mistaken in his opinion that any part of the appropriation under this paragraph is expended on the reclamation projects. There is provision in another part of the bill for work on those projects.

Mr. REEDER. Then, I was mistaken as to the particular source of the funds which the Agricultural Department is using in the experiments.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of either gentleman, but I think I can clear the situation. My understanding is that a very limited portion of this fund, an infinitesimal portion, is used in this way; that some of the gentlemen connected with these investigations do, in an advisory way, assist in the work on the reclamation projects.

Mr. SCOTT. That is quite probable. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy the attention of the committee longer than to say that the appropriation carried under this paragraph has been increased in the last five years from \$33,750 to \$75,000; that is to say, in five years it has more than doubled, and the investigations are of a character which do not call for a large amount of money. They can be conducted on a small scale, with just as satisfactory results as if the scale were very much larger, and I hope that the committee will not insist in overriding the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture and the judgment of the Committee on Agriculture by adopting an amendment which provides for an increase in the appropriation of 25 per cent.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRAIG. To discuss the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate is closed. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAIG) there were—ayes 30, noes 62.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number, and tellers are therefore refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "seventy" and inserting the word "eighty-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, line 12, strike out the word "seventy" and insert the word "eighty-five," so it will read "\$85,000."

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. CRAIG) there were—ayes 29, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer as a new paragraph, on page 59, between lines 13 and 14, the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, after line 13, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to bore artesian wells for the purpose of irrigation, \$25,000."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, or I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman desires to be heard upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas reserves the point of order on the proposed paragraph.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the chairman of the committee ought to make no objection to this amendment or to this proposed new paragraph which I seek to put in this bill. As I understand, one of the principal objects at least of most of the items of this bill is to enable the Department of Agriculture to make the necessary experiments in any particular line or along any particular ideas which would have a tendency to advance agriculture in any part of the country. Now, I am satisfied that those of us who live in or near territory where irrigation is used, either in part or wholly, for the purpose of raising agricultural crops, have had a great many inquiries from people who would like to have the Government experiment in localities where they do not have sufficient water from the streams, with the idea of putting down artesian wells for the purpose of irrigation. It costs a great deal of money for poor men to experiment in putting down artesian wells, and hence the individuals, the farmers, usually poor in those communities, are not able to risk the money that would be necessary to be used in making this kind of an experiment.

I do not desire to have the committee understand that I think that the department by reason of putting down these artesian wells would irrigate any large tract of land, but, on the other hand, they would go into the communities where they do not have a sufficient amount of water in the streams and conduct experiments in such places in different localities in the South and West, and when they once established in a certain community that it was possible to get artesian water, the people themselves then would bore their own artesian wells. The only reason the people do not do so now is for the reason, as I have said, that they can not afford to put up the money to be used in the experiment with the risk that the experiment may be a failure. It is a line, it seems to me, which ought to appeal to the chairman of the committee, and one in which the department can well afford to use some of the public funds in order to experiment along a line which if successful would enable large communities to become agricultural communities of the finest character where it is impossible on account of the lack of water now to raise anything in the way of agriculture.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Has not the Irrigation Bureau made experiments of this kind and spent a large sum of money trying to irrigate by the use of artesian wells?

Mr. NORRIS. I think not. I can say to the gentleman that a few years ago I took the matter up with the department with the idea of having them make an experiment in localities where there were indications that artesian water was to be found, and they refused to go into it, and said they did not—

Mr. PAYNE. If they enter upon a scheme of this kind, will it not take a great deal of money?

Mr. NORRIS. That may be true, and they informed me that they did not think they had authority to do it.

Mr. PAYNE. We spend seven or eight millions of dollars every year for the purpose of irrigation, and I do not see why it is not perfectly competent and good faith to try this.

Mr. NORRIS. This is the reason why it is not competent under existing law to-day. They said to me:

We have money which we can use in irrigation, but we know in advance that by putting down this particular well in this particular locality we will not succeed in getting enough water in that one well to lay out a whole plan of irrigation in this community. It will, perhaps, irrigate 20, 40, 80, or maybe, if a really good well be found, 160 acres of land; but the money that we have a right to use in this department is for the purpose of going into the field and laying out large schemes for the purpose of irrigation, and therefore we do not believe we have the legal right to do it, knowing in advance, even if the experiment is successful, that particular well will only irrigate a small amount of territory.

I believe the department is right. I never criticised them for it. I think they took the right view. But this proposition is to let the Government have \$25,000 to expend for the purpose of experimenting in that particular way.

Nobody believes, and I am not claiming, that if the amendment is passed that with one well they will get enough water to lay out a large irrigation scheme, but if they get a well in one community that produces a reasonable amount of water, it will mean that every settler in that community will put down his own well and have his own irrigating plant on his own farm.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that he ought to confine his amendment to exploration upon the public domain rather than upon private property?

Mr. NORRIS. I am very glad to have the gentleman's question, because I think it is one well worthy of consideration; but, in my judgment, it is not true that it ought to be confined to the public domain. From the very nature of the experiment I ask for in this appropriation it can do good only in the community where they are successful in finding an artesian well. An artesian well found on government domain would do no good to anybody or anyone unless they were in that immediate community. An artesian well sunk in a place where they use water for irrigation, and where it is necessary to irrigate in order to raise crops for the benefit of all the people, would do just as much good, and more good, if it was in a community where it was thickly settled, and would thus be an experiment that, if successful, would enable every man in the community, whether he was on government land or deeded land, to make the same kind of an artesian well for his own individual use. It is an experiment which, if successful, will do good, not because the particular experiment that, if successful, will in itself do any particular good, but it will demonstrate that in the communities where these artesian wells are found everybody will be able to get artesian water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order. I do not believe this is subject to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Nebraska on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, for a moment before pressing the point of order, I would like to make this statement: There is an enormous expanse of territory in the United States where irrigation is needed. To sink an artesian well at any place in that territory would develop the fact as to whether water could be obtained at the very point the well was sunk, but it would not answer the question as to whether water would be obtained on the adjoining quarter section, or, indeed, the adjoining acre of land.

It follows, therefore, that in order to be of any value such exploration as the gentleman wishes us to undertake would have to be carried on all over this immense territory. There would have to be an uncountable number of wells drilled, and the expense to the National Treasury would be appalling. For the reason, therefore, that I do not believe it to be a function of the Government to undertake an enterprise of that kind, I make the point of order; and I shall be glad to discuss that question with the gentleman. My point of order, of course, is that the amendment is new legislation, a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to do work which under existing law he is not authorized to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me the amendment I have offered clearly is not legislation. It runs along the particular line of the preceding paragraph we have just read. If

it is subject to the point of order, then there is no item in this bill in regard to irrigation or any other object that is not likewise subject to the point of order. It pertains particularly to irrigation, and it is one of the means by which experiments shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law that gives him authority to make any other experiment mentioned in this bill. I do not think there can be any reasonable claim that this is legislation in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The statute provides for experimental artesian wells in the Reclamation Service. That statute, however, requires that the money shall be taken from the reclamation fund. The amendment proposed takes the money direct from the Treasury and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to do a work that there appears to be no authority of law now for him to do. The paragraph just read, to which the amendment is offered, was not objected to as being in violation of the rules. That question is, therefore, not before the Chair. But in its largest sense the section that has just been read refers to an investigation of agriculture in its broadest meaning. The proposed amendment goes much further than an investigation in agriculture. It proposes the boring of artesian wells for the purpose of irrigation. The Chair thinks the point of order well taken, and sustains it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Drainage investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands and to prepare plans for the removal of surplus waters by drainage and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on drainage, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all necessary expenses, \$78,860.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I will make the point of order, and help the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MANN. There is no authority of law for this investigation or this experiment. The Agricultural Department, by its organic act or by any subsequent act, has not been authorized to make this investigation in reference to swamp and other wet lands; and while the appropriation has been carried from year to year, and I apprehend it will be carried when this appropriation bill becomes law, I think it is just as well to say it is subject to the point of order, and might properly go out here, considering the desire to stick in a lot of extraneous matters for the investigation of such things.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. Gentlemen are very well aware of the fact that there are a great many provisions in this bill subject to the point of order in case anybody cares to raise it. I presume the gentleman from Nebraska, who first suggested the point of order, did so in order to test the opinion he had expressed a moment ago—that if the amendment he offered was not in order, there were similar provisions not in order; and the gentleman was quite right in that statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, as the gentleman refers to me, I desire to state that I reserved the point of order to give the gentleman an illustration that I was going to do better by him than he had done by me. I was going to give him an opportunity to explain the item, and then withdraw the point of order. I wanted to give him an illustration of returning good for evil. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I have not misunderstood the object of the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that gentlemen are not speaking to the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen are not discussing the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will not withdraw the point of order, because I think the work is important and should go on.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have no special objection to the item in the bill as it stands, although I think it is a pretty nearly useless expenditure of public money. I thought possibly that the gentleman from Nebraska reserved the point of order in connection with some other gentleman, perhaps, calling attention to provisions where there might be some amendment offered, amendments which would be subject to the point of order, but upon which no point of order could be made after this item was under consideration. If it is satisfactory to let this item stay in the bill in the way it is, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I was so impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois that I raise the point of order. Because the gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn it, he can not withdraw it and take that privilege away from any other Member. I was so much impressed with the force of his argument that if he withdraws it I will make it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point comes too late.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, not at all.

Mr. LEVER. The Clerk had begun to read.

The CHAIRMAN. No debate had intervened, and the Clerk had not read. The Chair thinks the point of order is within time, and if the gentleman from New York insists on it, the Chair sustains it.

Mr. PERKINS. I insist on it, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Office of Experiment Stations, \$1,067,820.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Office of Experiment Stations is conducting in some of the Western States experiments to demonstrate what can be accomplished by the use of a limited amount of water for irrigation in connection with a nonirrigable farm—that is, they carry on what are called "dry-farming" experiments along with irrigation experiments, in order to show the farmer in dry regions how he can successfully combine the two methods of irrigation and dry farming. This leads me to observe that of all the important and useful movements in this country at this time, and particularly in the western country, that known as the "dry-farming movement" is the most important and promises to be the most successful. Four years ago the dry-farming congress was organized, and it holds annual meetings, at which are discussed the principles of what is known as "dry farming." The term is another name for scientific farming, and it treats of the cultivation of the soil by the application of scientific methods. In the West those scientific methods have for their object the retention in the soil of all the moisture that falls, in order that crops may be grown with an amount of moisture that, except for this scientific cultivation, would not be sufficient to produce an ordinary crop. But this scientific-farming movement is important not only to the West, but to all portions of the country.

The principles of scientific dry farming, deep plowing, subsoiling, thorough cultivation, frequent surface cultivation, cultivation after the crop is planted and while it is growing, all these when applied to worn-out soils, and soils that have largely lost their fertility, are wonderfully helpful in restoring such soils to a profitable crop-growing condition. So that this movement, which had its beginning in the West, and which is now spreading throughout that country, is not only going to be helpful in adding vastly to the wheat area of the country, vastly to the area which can be made productive and support large populations on portions of the public domain now unoccupied, but the movement will, in my opinion, be of vast benefit to people in the East who are studying the best methods for the restoration of the worn-out soils of some of the older States of the Union. This work, thus carried on by the Office of Experiment Stations, has encouraged men to take up public land in the West heretofore considered valueless except for grazing purposes; and the last Congress wisely passed a law increasing the amount of the homestead in certain regions, with a view to further encouraging this dry-farming development.

I am glad to be able to say to the House that the effect of that law has been to open up to settlement large regions heretofore unoccupied. It has brought upon our manless land in many portions of the West the landless man from the Middle and Eastern States, and under the improved methods now practiced in the name of dry farming these men are conquering the desert, making fertile vast areas heretofore given over to the grazing of bands of sheep and cattle, and adding vastly to the agricultural wealth of the country. No bill passed by Congress in many years has been more useful than the 320-acre or dry-farm homestead bill of the last Congress. And no present movement in the West promises more to the future of that region in the way of agricultural development than the so-called "dry-farming movement." These scientific methods must be adopted in much of our western country in order to make farming thoroughly successful. Therefore we shall carry on the work through necessity, which eventually will, as the methods are adopted farther east, be of vast benefit.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC ROADS.

Salaries, Office of Public Roads: One director, who shall be a scientist and have charge of all scientific and technical work, \$3,000; 1 chief clerk, \$1,600; 1 clerk, \$1,320; 5 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,140;

4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$900; 1 laborer, \$680; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; 1 messenger, \$600; 1 messenger boy, \$480; 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$21,260.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, after line 10, insert:

"For the purpose of encouraging the permanent improvement of the highways in the different States utilized by the Government for rural free-postal delivery, the amount to be apportioned to the improvement of the roads on each rural route not to exceed one-fourth of the total cost of improving such post-roads, the remainder to be borne by the State, county, or township in which said route is located, \$5,000,000."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, there is no paragraph in the bill under consideration which carries an appropriation for a more worthy bureau of the Government than what is known as the Office of Public Roads. There is no question that since the creation of this bureau of the Federal Government it has disseminated all over this country information in regard to the improvement of our public highways which has resulted in an impetus being given to the improvement of the roads in every State of the Union.

My idea is, however, that the Federal Government should go further than merely to disseminate useful information in regard to good roads. I believe that the time has come for the Federal Government actively to participate in the great work of improving the primary arteries of commerce, those highways over which the farmers of the country transport the products of the land from the farm to the railroad.

One of the greatest drawbacks and obstacles to the further extension and even maintenance of the present rural free-delivery service is the miserable condition of the roads over which the Post-Office Department has to send its rural carriers.

The Constitution undoubtedly gives the power to the Federal Government to expend money for the permanent improvement of those public roads which are utilized by the rural free-delivery branch of the Post-Office Department, and I believe that the improvement of these highways all over the country will confer even a greater blessing upon the people, not alone those engaged in agricultural pursuits, but upon all our people, than will the expenditure of untold millions of dollars for the improvement of our rivers and the water highways of the country. The improvement of the public highways on the land is just as important as the improvement of the public highways on the water, and the plan which I would here suggest is that the Government set aside each year an amount of money not less than that mentioned in my amendment to be used for the purpose of cooperating with the respective States, with the counties, and with the townships for the improvement of the roads utilized by the rural free delivery.

You can call this, if you will, a national subsidy for good roads.

I live in a State which contains the geographic center of the United States, about as far as it is possible to be from those States containing great seaports, States which have great maritime interests which are now asking the Federal Government for a subsidy or increased ocean mail pay, or whatever you may call it, to assist in building up the merchant marine, and I want to say that I am heartily in favor of federal aid for this laudable work both from a business and from a patriotic standpoint, and in return I believe that it would be no more than fair for the Representatives of those States which would receive the benefit of a subsidy for an increased merchant marine to vote for a subsidy for the construction of good roads, to be largely used in the great agricultural regions of the West and South.

During the month of December in 1909 the National Good Roads Association of the United States held its annual convention in the city of Topeka, Kans., and in response to the call for this meeting in the interest of good roads issued by the national association, and in response to the proclamation issued by the governor of the State of Kansas indorsing the movement, there assembled at Topeka nearly 1,000 delegates from all parts of this country, from Alaska, and from the Territories as well as from the States, and there issued from this convention resolutions in favor of the improvement of our highways, which I shall ask permission to set forth in my remarks.

I know that the prevailing sentiment in Congress is perhaps opposed to federal aid in the construction of roads in the States further than the general assistance given in the existing appropriation in this bill, but I believe that there can be evolved a plan of partial federal aid and assistance which will work in the nature of a subsidy and aid and an incentive to the devel-

opment and construction of good roads all over this country which should receive the indorsement of this House.

I have a bill pending which I am in hopes may be acted upon favorably and which, if so acted upon, will in time give to the great West an object lesson in good-roads construction. The bill I speak of provides for the construction of a military highway between Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley, the two greatest military posts in the United States, both of which are located in the State of Kansas, 110 miles apart. Large bodies of troops and great quantities of material move each year back and forth across the country between these great posts. At Fort Leavenworth are located two great federal penitentiaries—one under the control of the War Department, for military prisoners, and the other under the control of the Department of Justice, for other federal prisoners. In the course of a short time the labor of all the thousands of prisoners in these institutions will no longer be needed for the work in which they are now engaged, that of constructing the new buildings of these institutions. It will then be necessary either to put these prisoners at work manufacturing articles of merchandise which will come into conflict and competition with the product of free labor or to put them to work upon some public enterprise.

I propose to utilize the surplus labor in these institutions at times when it can be spared upon the construction of this military highway between these two great military posts. The people of my district and of the State of Kansas have become so interested in the project that the farmers in the townships through which the proposed military road will run have held meetings and pledged themselves to furnish to the Government free of charge all of the rock necessary to be used in the construction of the road. Here it will be possible to utilize the surplus labor of these prisoners, and I want to say that, despite what the wardens of some penitentiaries say, it is a boon to the inmate of any penitentiary to put him to work where he can work in God's sunshine and breathe fresh, outdoor air. It is a labor merciful to the prisoner in every way.

So that, if this opportunity is offered, the Government can construct a piece of public road which will have educational value for the people of the West by showing them how to proceed in similar improvement work, and the work on this road can be done with but little extra expense to the Government other than the maintenance of the prisoners engaged in the work.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this idea of a federal subsidy for the construction of good roads all over this land will receive the serious attention of this body.

Proceedings of annual convention of National Good Roads Association, December 14, 1909, at Topeka, Kans.

ASK NATIONAL AID FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTRY'S ROADS.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) newspapers, December 15, 1909.]

The tenth annual convention of the National Good Roads Association, which is meeting in Topeka, will to-day declare for national aid for the construction of permanent roads. This action will be taken when the committee on resolutions presents its recommendations to the assembly this afternoon. The committee will recommend that the delegates of the convention upon their return to their homes prepare and circulate petitions in their communities and present them to their respective Members of Congress. This committee on resolutions is composed of the presidents of the state associations represented at the convention, and H. W. McAfee, of Topeka, is chairman.

President Jackson, of the National Good Roads Association, and Mr. McAfee, president of the Kansas association and secretary of the national association, are both strong advocates of national aid, and yesterday afternoon stated that the principal resolution which the committee would recommend to-day would be one declaring for national aid.

President Jackson thinks that the National Government should build public turnpikes connecting the capitals of each State in the Union and that the individual States should build good roads connecting the county seats. This would give the country a network of permanent roads that would afford ready and easy communication between the principal cities and towns of the country.

Speaking of this, President Jackson said:

"Suppose the National Government should institute aid for road construction and improvement. I feel sure that work would also begin in every State and in a few years we would have a magnificent system. A road worthy the name should reach every farm in Kansas and this country, if the Government would spend one-half the sum on good roads as it is expending for war purposes in times of peace. I think that it will be shown that any reasonable amount spent by your county, State, or Nation will bring handsome returns. It has been estimated that more than a billion dollars is lost annually in this country on account of inefficient roads. It is a disgrace to our country and should not be permitted."

The convention began its sessions in Topeka yesterday morning with an address of welcome by Governor Stubbs. Representative Hall was crowded. Yesterday afternoon there were between three and four hundred out-of-town delegates registered at the convention headquarters, and many more were still coming in. It is believed that there are a number who have not registered who are in the city.

"That good roads figure largely in the moral and intellectual development of the people of the country, and have been a great civilizer,"

was the statement made by President Taft in a letter to Governor Stubbs, which was read at the session yesterday morning.

President Taft's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 16, 1909.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: From your letter I understand you are to have a national good roads convention at Topeka, Kans., December 14 to 15. I take great interest in the movement which that convention is to promote in the development of good roads.

My own view of the good roads question is that it is chiefly a state function, and that all the States ought to unite in an effort to promote good roads. I do not think that the farmers are as much interested in the matter as they ought to be.

The truth is, I think, that the good roads have much to do with the use of waterways and also with the question of railway transportation, because the difficulties of getting to waterways and railways are the great burdens that the farmers have to bear.

I believe that good roads figure very largely in the moral and intellectual development of the people, because they affect directly communication between farmers and the neighboring towns, and the closer this is the more in touch are farmers with the general condition in the country.

Next to education, the system of good roads is the greatest civilizer. I have no doubt that much remains to be learned by experiment and otherwise concerning the economy in the construction of roads and their durability; but it is most gratifying to have such a meeting as that you are to have in Kansas, which shows a national awakening as to the subject and gives an earnest of progress in the right direction.

Sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

USE FEDERAL PRISONERS.

DAN R. ANTHONY, Jr., Representative from the First Kansas Congressional District, at Washington, advocates the use of the federal prisoners for building roads. In a letter read yesterday afternoon, he said as follows:

"There is no public matter in which I take more interest than the movement to secure good roads in this country. I am firmly convinced that there is no economic problem in which the American farmer should be more vitally interested than in the improvement of the public highway. The enormous cost to the farmer of the West in the moving of his crops from the farm to the railway station over the bad roads which prevail in the Middle West for at least six months of the year runs into many millions of dollars, and could be saved by the improvement of these highways. Ever since I have been in Congress it has been my ambition to have the Government use the labor of the federal convicts at Fort Leavenworth to build a military highway to connect Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley. So far I have been unable to secure the passage of legislation to this end because of the fact that the labor of the prisoners is now used, and will be used for several years yet to come, in the construction of the buildings for the two new government penitentiaries being erected at Fort Leavenworth, but I have secured the approval of the plan by President Taft, General Bell, and other high officials of the War Department, and in my opinion the labor of the convicts at Fort Leavenworth will be put upon the construction of this road just as soon as their labor is no longer demanded in government construction at Fort Leavenworth, and it will be used for the construction of this fine highway before any of this labor is put to work manufacturing articles which will come in competition with free labor."

Chancellor Frank Strong, of Kansas University, spoke at the session yesterday afternoon. Mr. Strong pointed out the fact that while it was supposed that the modern agricultural and road theories were in advance of all time, the Romans knew more about raising crops from bad ground and building permanent roads than we do now. He also said that the Greeks knew a great deal about irrigation.

"We don't know how to build good roads yet," said Chancellor Strong, "and we won't have any good roads until the farmers of Kansas make up their minds to do something and make some progress. I hope that the time will soon come in Kansas when the local community will decide to act. It is the local community that has the power and you can't do anything about good roads until the small communities decide to have them, and will take the responsibility for them."

President Henry J. Waters, of the State Agricultural College, also spoke at the session yesterday afternoon. In his address he said that the need was for greater intelligence on the part of the rural residents and an increase in the production per acre.

"The lack of good communication in winter is causing a constant exodus from the rural districts to the cities, and it is lowering the standard of the people who live in the open country and striking at the vital spot of our sustenance, because our cities are not self-sustaining, and must draw upon the best blood of country life. To stop this exodus, you must keep the people of the country from being isolated two and three months of the year."

"During the past twenty-five years the output of the country has been materially increased, but only on account of the increased acreage, not an increase per acre. To meet this situation—to increase the yield per acre—we must increase the product per acre and to do this means greater intelligence on the part of the farmers, and the first step is to keep the best farmers on the farm."

At the afternoon session Mrs. Charles F. Spencer, representing the Federation of Women's Clubs of the State, read a paper, in which she reviewed the good roads and agricultural exhibits at the Alaska-Yukon Exposition at Seattle. In part she said:

"The Federation of Women's Clubs has always shown its willingness to help in every cause that has for its object the betterment of humanity, and it stands not only for higher culture, but for every practical improvement that makes life more useful and more enjoyable for this generation and for those who are to come after us, and while the women may not go out and personally work on the roads they will be a power in creating public sentiment in regard to the need of better highways."

W. S. Gearhart, state highway engineer of Kansas, in his address at the meeting yesterday afternoon, said that he met a great many farmers every day, and he found that they were not so indifferent to good roads as was generally supposed.

"The trouble is," said Mr. Gearhart, "that the farmers have no organized way of doing road work. Our present road system does not encourage men to fit themselves for intelligent road work. Nowadays, when men do their road work, they go out with the intention of having a good time, and I know of cases where the men have played craps while supposed to be working out their poll tax. There should be a rigid system of overseeing the road work. This should be the duty of

the county engineer, and to assist him he ought to have 2 or 3 aids. A county engineer who would take up this work could earn his yearly salary in three months by conserving the money spent on the roads and seeing that it really goes into the roads. Taxpayers do not get \$1 worth of work for \$1 in money. Sometimes less than 40 per cent gets into the road, and this condition ought to be changed so that the taxpayer gets his \$1 worth for \$1 spent. To do this, a business basis should be adopted by which the responsibility is narrowed down to one man."

Mr. Gearhart said that two-thirds of the money appropriated for county work each year went into caring for bridges and culverts. He advocated the use of concrete in the building of bridges and culverts and that would end all expense, allowing the money to go into the building of permanent roads that was formerly used in keeping up less permanent bridges and culverts. The end of road work should be macadam, Mr. Gearhart said, but while these were being built good dirt roads should be kept up.

James S. Tustin, of St. Louis, claims agent for the Missouri Pacific Railroad, in an address pointed out that it is not the railroads that are responsible for the excessive cost of getting the grain to market, but the poor roads.

Governor Stubbs, who made the principal address of welcome at the opening of the convention, said that road work should be put on a business basis. In part he said:

"It is a very great pleasure for me to welcome you here for the great Commonwealth of Kansas."

"Transportation is one of the great problems of the day. It is divided into three classes. There are the railroads, the waterways, and the public highways. The railroads were built up because we had to have them first. Forty years ago we were building homes and settling on the farms."

"Now we are doing the things that are building up the Nation in a social way as well as to give profits. While billions of dollars have been put into railroads, but comparatively little has been put into waterways and roads. I believe that you are here to-day to discuss a problem which will affect the happiness and welfare of the Nation."

"I believe that it is a good investment to build good roads. I think that we should take a common-sense view of the question. A railroad that is well built pays, while one that is not well built does not pay, and the same will apply to roads. I think that every community of farmers ought to have a man on the roads to make them good, to keep them in repair. When you put this on a business basis and have good roads in Kansas, no one would want to go back to the old conditions."

President Jackson is a strong advocate of national aid, and in his address yesterday morning touched upon that subject as follows:

"It is folly to assume that abutting property owners should be required to pay for the good roads. They are public property and owned by no individual. They are owned by all the people and should be paid for by all the people."

"As the public highways are owned by all the people and should be paid for by all the people, we should have government aid. There was never any system built in any land that was not built by the Government. For many years there has been an increasing demand for national aid."

MR. COOLEY'S ADDRESS.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Journal, December 15, 1909.]

George W. Cooley, Minnesota state highway engineer, gave an address which was appreciated by the road experts.

"The principal road system now before the people is the stone of macadam," said Mr. Cooley. "This system has been in vogue for centuries. We can't afford now to cover this country with the roads we need."

"The system of tar or asphalt macadam roads is gaining in popularity."

"The two principles in road construction are construction and drainage."

"If you can't get the water away from the road, get the road away from the water."

"We have to depend for twenty-five to fifty years largely on good earth roads, and the question that we have to consider is how to build them with the least expense."

"The secret of the magnificent roads in France and Germany lies not in the construction, but in the maintenance. A stitch in time saves nine; and the people in those countries realize it."

"In Norway and Sweden the roads are of ordinary macadam and most strongly recommend themselves in price and in economy, subject to the objection of faulty alignment, and grades, and the narrowness of the improved portions. The same objections apply to the roads of Denmark."

"In Germany," Mr. Cooley states, "the macadam roads constructed with tar and asphalt binders were most highly considered, while in France the most approved roads are made under a variety of specifications." Concerning the roads of all these countries, including also Switzerland, Italy, and England, Mr. Cooley says:

"The general plan of construction in all these countries for general service roads has been macadam, constructed under the usual approved specifications, bound generally with the finer particles of the principal aggregate, but in many places tar and asphalt binders are used. Such a variety of methods are employed that it is impossible to specialize, but it is apparent from an examination of several pieces of the best highways that the latter methods give the best results. The Great North road of England is, in places, the best example of such construction, and seems to stand the wear of heavy traffic and rapid automobile travel better than any. Roads of approximately the same construction built by the New Jersey highway commission are to all appearances the equal of any European roads."

Asked which roads most strongly recommended themselves to him, from a standpoint of general excellence, Mr. Cooley said:

"To a western American accustomed to the country roads of earth, all European roads are excellent (with some exceptions), but as a rule, in comparing our methods of construction with theirs, we lose nothing in the comparison."

Regarding the systems of maintenance, Mr. Cooley was most strongly impressed with those of France and Germany. He said:

"Roads of France and Germany are constructed and maintained under a rigid system of supervision. Perishable material is entirely prohibited in the former, and continual repair provided for in the latter. Also a strict accountability is required from all having charge of the work."

Prof. W. C. Hoad, of the engineering department of the state university, spoke in part as follows:

"This country is a big country, and this movement for good roads is a good movement. This movement is diversified. In Massachusetts and Connecticut they have needed and have secured for their country thoroughfares hard rock roads.

"The need is just coming to us, and it is one of the next steps of our progress.

"In the construction of hard roads it isn't worth our while to do all our experimenting before we learn what are the best methods, as we can profit by the experience of others. The same can be said of oil roads. We can study the ground that has been gone over in California.

"Now, there are certain general principles in connection with building hard roads; for example, a good, solid roadbed is a necessity. An other general principle is that we must have some durable material for the road surface. Beyond that there are hardly any principles that can be generally applied; it becomes a local matter.

"The requirement for rigidity or solidity necessitates good subdrainage. It is the result we want. Keeping the water out of the road will help preserve its solidity.

"We do not have the material for road building that they have in New Jersey, New York, and other States, but we do have good limestones, and limestones make good roads.

"They cost less to construct, but do not wear quite as long. We have been running a series of road tests in connection with our laboratory at the state university, and find in many parts of the State are excellent road-building materials. It often comes to the point of which of two or three different materials should be used.

"The matter of thickness of the road is largely a local matter. In the East they have 6-inch roads. Here 8 inches is considered about the proper depth for our limestone.

"The construction of good roads should be along the lines of business—that is, the thoroughfares that are used most are the ones which will justify an immediate expenditure.

"If it can be shown that road construction will more than pay for its cost through a saving to the users, then the building of them is justified.

"It seems to me that our road development should be done by local money and service. This is my own opinion about it, although I know that it will not meet the approval of all road enthusiasts.

"The hard thing is to make a start in good road building, but when we once start it will not be so difficult."

PASSENGER MAN TALKS.

H. G. Kallil, assistant general freight and passenger agent for the Union Pacific, was next on the programme. "We know that the question of good roads is of interest to almost every one," said Mr. Kallil. "The question of good roads is, of course, universal. We have found in handling the freight traffic that if we can get the produce brought to us throughout the year and not have things congested it is of considerable benefit to us.

"If it were not for our elevator service along our roads I don't know what we would do. We appreciate from the standpoint of the railroad good roads, and if the farmers would quit talking politics and would help to get good roads it would be a good thing."

The last address on the morning programme was by Curtis Hill, state highway engineer of Missouri. He said in part:

"The improvement of wagon roads means the improvement of our own property.

"The people of these States have so long been under the impression that road money has been wasted they rather hesitate about putting more money into roads. The money has been lost on account of a lack of knowledge of efficient work. Whenever the general public is willing to submit to scientific and competent supervision and leave politics out of the affair, we will get good roads.

"State tax and expert supervision is the prescription of good roads. There are not more than one out of ten of our petty road officials who have a competent knowledge of roadmaking. It is the fault of our venerable system and not the officials, as they are generally honest.

"Like everything else, it depends largely upon the individual put in charge. Our law is in many places poorly applied, but our law is good."

Mr. Hill is a strong advocate of putting convicts on road construction, and talked at length on this point.

Miss Anna M. Grady, of Chicago, treasurer of the National Good Roads Association, gave an interesting talk, during the course of which she urged the importance of the women waking up to the realization that they can by their influence do much toward securing for the country better thoroughfares.

"I think it is lamentable that the women of to-day, as intelligent as they are, do not take a more active part in a movement of this nature," said Miss Grady. "In different parts of the country the women have banded together in the cause of woman suffrage; that may and may not be all right, but here is a cause they can have a voice in where they are more welcome.

"The children of the country attend a rural district school for a few years, and, in order to attain a higher education, they are compelled to leave home and board, perhaps, in town. This is the starting point of the great trend to the city. The boy comes to the city and, becoming acquainted with city ways, does not care to return to the farm under the existing conditions.

"When the burden becomes too heavy for the shoulders of the old folks, they, too, come to the city to live with their children, and the farm naturally falls into the hands of a tenant, and you all know what that means." The speaker then called upon the men to talk good roads to their wives upon their return home from the convention.

ADVANCEMENT OF ROAD WORK SLOW.

R. J. Clancey, tax commissioner of the Union Pacific Railroad, who substituted for N. H. Loomis, chief of the legal department of the road, spoke on the cost of hauling products to the railroad station and of the benefit of better roads.

"While no branch of the transportation problem is of greater importance than wagon transportation, it is alone distinguished for lack of progress. Wagon transportation is of primary importance because of its essentiality in transporting the products of the farm to the railroad station. The importance of this form of transportation intensifies as you consider it from the standpoint of distance, volume, and cost. The average wagon haul on foodstuffs in the United States is 8.1 miles, and the ton-mile cost is approximately 28 cents. A normal crop of barley, corn, oats, and wheat constitutes more than 26,000,000 average wagon loads and consumes 17,800,000 working days in moving their crop of wheat, oats, corn, and barley from the farm to the railroad sta-

tion—about \$61,000,000. It costs the farmers that amount to move these four cereals named a distance of 8.1 miles.

"To reduce the cost of wagon transportation, the farmer must increase the load tonnage. Two things are necessary for this—reduction of the gradients and hard surfacing of the roadbeds.

"New methods are needed to remedy the lack of progression; the whole system of road construction should be under the direct supervision of the States and Federal Government. There should be national and state highway commissions. Wards of the State, penal or otherwise, capable of physical endurance, should be impressed into good road construction."

George W. Cooley, state highway engineer of Minnesota, made an address yesterday morning and rehearsed some of the principles of road construction and drainage. He also emphasized the importance of "a stitch in time" in the maintenance of the roads.

Clark Hudson, representing the Oklahoma Federation of Commercial Clubs, gave an interesting report of the trip of the Yoakum good-roads special, which recently carried delegates from the good roads associations of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana through the Atlantic Coast States from Maryland to New Hampshire.

The Kansas Good Roads Association met yesterday morning before the session of the regular convention, and a number of new members were added to the rolls. The membership now numbers about 115. An effort will be made, following the convention, to affiliate the state organization with the Southwestern District Association, which is now composed of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. Missouri will join this association and Kansas has been invited to do so, but no action has yet been taken.

RESOLUTIONS.

The resolutions are, in part, as follows:

The National Good Roads Association, at Topeka, December 14 and 15, believing that among all the appropriations made for various purposes and believing in the organic and underlying principle of the greatest amount of good to the greatest number of people, and that no appropriation made by our National Government could benefit more people than one for the aid of building public highways in the different States, and that the time has come when such aid should be given: Be it

Resolved, That we demand a system or fixed policy by our National Government and an annual appropriation in the States for the express purpose of erecting and constructing permanent public highways; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon Congress and the United States Senators to enact and place upon our statute books a law looking to that end.

Whereas a letter from Congressman ANTHONY was read before the good-roads convention, in which he advocates the construction of a military road between Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley by appropriation and convict labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention hereby heartily indorses the idea set forth in his letter and the effort put forth to bring about the completion of this plan. Be it further

Resolved, That we ask the delegates here present to urge their Congressman and Senator to assist in this movement. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Congressman ANTHONY.

As in many of our States laws exist whereby the poll and road tax may be either paid in cash or worked out in person: Be it

Resolved, That we demand of our state senators and representatives that they use their influence toward the passage of a bill whereby these taxes must be paid in cash, that better results may be obtained from this money on our public highways: Be it

Resolved, That we demand of our state senators and representatives that they work for the passage of a bill whereby all the money paid into the several States through the state licensing of electric, gasoline, and steam driven pleasure and commercial vehicles shall be set aside for the exclusive use of the improving of our state highways.

We urge the construction by the National Government of a system of permanent highways connecting Washington, D. C., with the capital of every State and Territory.

Whereas Wyandotte County has 40 miles of macadam road and Leavenworth County has 10 miles of macadam within its borders, and there remains 8 miles of unpaved road between the counties, which, if macadamized, would give the public a metal road from Fort Leavenworth to Kansas City, Kans.

Whereas this road is traveled more than any road in the State of Kansas, and it would be of the greatest public benefit to complete this connection between two of the most thickly settled counties in Kansas.

Whereas section — of the Kansas statutes for — provides for the construction of a modern highway between the cities of Leavenworth and the city of Kansas City, Kans., the same to be constructed by the State with convict labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Good Roads Association hereby indorse the plan as set forth, and encourage generally the construction of good roads by the use of convict labor, and that the delegates present use their best efforts to encourage the construction of public highways by such labor: Be it further

Resolved, That such construction be done under the direct supervision of the state highway engineers: Be it

Resolved, That a true and accurate copy of the resolutions adopted by this National Good Roads Congress, assembled in Topeka, Kans., December 14 and 15, be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives of the United States.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND DRAINAGE.*

[By W. R. Golt, president Oklahoma Good Roads Association.]

To undertake to locate, drain, and construct a railroad, to build a bridge, or a building without plans, would be disastrous, financially and otherwise, and subject one to just criticism, which applies with equal emphasis to road location, drainage, and construction.

Skilled location of a road accurately determines route, drainage, and grades, and skilled supervision and construction intelligently and economically executes the plans of the engineer, and conserves the moneys, resulting in enduring, permanent work at minimum cost.

The use of any material for bridges, culverts, or surfacing of a road that will not resist the elements, and sustain the wear of travel,

* Paper read at the Tenth National Good Roads Convention, Topeka, Kans., December 14 and 15, 1909.

is reprehensible indeed; such makeshifts should not be countenanced or permitted if permanent construction be intended or desired.

Build for all time, and 'tis cheap at any cost; and where the moneys are derived from the voting of bonds, posterity has every right to expect that there will be something left for them that will at least endure until the bonds mature; but temporary construction and makeshifts, without adequate plans and estimates, will be forever calling for continuous expenditure for maintenance, and prove, as has been demonstrated in the past, "an expensive luxury to the taxpayer."

Education is the one great factor that makes the engineer a necessity in road location and construction. His training for the purpose qualifies him to obtain results; whereas one uneducated and untrained usually leaves us "in the mud."

A mixture of soil or dirt and water produces mud, the depth of consistency being determined by the quantity of water present. 'Tis simply a question of cause and effect; remove and prevent the water from obtaining access to the soils, and subsequent evaporation and absorption will leave only dry soils or dirt remaining after a mud hole is drained. Such a simple remedy for the treatment of a mud hole surely can be applied by any ordinary mortal, though he be not educated or skilled in the work. Where is the mortal who is willing to admit he does not know enough to "run water downhill." Strange as it may seem, there do be mortals who venture where "engineers" fear to tread, who do attempt to run water uphill—a most extravagant and expensive undertaking, never accomplished by the wisest road overseer who ever built a mud hole—and there do be many.

In the location of a road or highway, a survey of the route will locate the road so as to obtain the shortest distances between the two points to be connected. Do not deviate from a straight line between these two points, except where first cost would be greatly reduced by locating on a more circuitous route, either to avoid heavy cuts through hills or high embankments across valleys, or in case property through which the road would pass would be excessively damaged. The less mileage there is to maintain, the less the cost of maintenance. The shorter the distance the less time it requires to cover the road between the two points. All of our railroads built in the years gone by are now making cut-offs to shorten distance, and are reducing grades by cutting through the hills and filling across the valleys to obtain approximate levels, and enable them to draw the maximum tonnage with the minimum expenditure of power—an economical feature which also applies to wagon roads, and could be profitably utilized in their location and construction. Locate the roads as direct as is practical and possible, and to reach points off and away from the direct line or route, locate lateral or branch roads. Under no circumstances, when easy grades obtain, should the highway or thoroughfare deviate from a direct course from the point of departure and the objective point. The direct line or location, that enables the engineer to eliminate grades and obtain required drainage, is the most economical, even though first cost is greater, for the reason that it will require less power to move the tonnage that must pass over the roadway, and less time to cover the decreased or shortened distance. The old adage, "time is money," aptly obtains when a circuitous, undrained, muddy road with steep grades is encountered, though the locator, evidently, was not cognizant of the fact.

After location is determined, grades and drainage follow, and both should receive careful attention and consideration at the hands of the engineer. First, the grade line must be established, to reduce the hills, and fill the valleys, and bring the roadway to a maximum uniform slope or grade, of easy ascent and descent; not too steep, so as to permit heavy loads to be hauled without overtaxing the team, and where long ascents obtain, rests or level sections should be introduced in the grade line at proper intervals, to enable the teams to obtain a breathing place and take the loads off the collars. This will materially increase the tonnage that can be drawn, and be a factor in determining the value of the road commercially, as the steep sections of the road limit the tonnage though the major portion of the road may be practically level. Hence the economy of keeping down steep grades by cutting the hills as far as practical, even at a greater initial cost. After locating route and establishing grade lines, the material necessary for construction of embankment should be borrowed in such manner as to leave perfect drainage in both ditches, and to permit free run-off of the storm water: for perfect drainage and proper diverting of storm waters are the basic principles in the construction and maintenance of good roads.

The question of proper and perfect drainage is an essential feature, and is the principal factor in determining the cost of road maintenance. Avoid concentration of storm water, and do not attempt to carry it long distances in the upper ditch to save the cost of an additional culvert. Dispose of it at the first opportunity, and it will cease to add to the problems that confront us in road construction. When an embankment across a waterway imposes as a dam, and obstructs the free run-off of the storm water, provide a culvert under and across the roadway of adequate size to accommodate the storm water from each drainage area centering at each waterway, thus effectually draining the subbase of the embankment so as to give it a dry footing. Keep the subbase drained and dry and it will reduce the cost of maintenance to a minimum. The one enemy of good roads that must be continually combated is water. Unmolested, it will undermine and wash away the most expensive and carefully constructed roadway, and if permitted to stand in ditches on the upper side of the roadway it will seep through the sub-base and destroy the embankment. Thorough and perfect drainage secures a dry, permanent sub-base, without which a good road can not be maintained with any reasonable cost. Build from the sub-base up. Expensive surfacing of roads with macadam, asphalt, oil or any other approved material, can not stand under travel without a dry, well-drained sub-base, which is the foundation of all permanent road construction, and must obtain.

Storm water conducted long distances in a ditch is constantly augmented by run-off from intersected water courses, and is ultimately concentrated and becomes difficult to handle; whereas if disposed of at frequent intervals, when the volume is limited, and conducted under and across the roadway into the lower ditch or spillway by small, permanent culverts constructed of vitrified culvert pipe, stone masonry, or cement concrete, the concentration of the storm water does not result, and its disposal is easily and economically accomplished and the sub-base kept drained and dry. Assist the storm water in following its natural course from each drainage area. Simulate natural conditions, and provide an adequate culvert of sufficient port or capacity to accommodate the storm water that concentrates at each identical waterway obstructed by the embankment. The drainage should then be perfect, provided the lower ditch or spillway is constructed to accommodate the run-off. Fall is the factor that determines the velocity of the water and the carrying capacity of a flow line. Without fall there would not be any run-off to the storm water. Water is acted

upon by the same general law that governs solids, and falls precisely as fast. Release a drop of water at a given point, permitting it to fall in space, and at the expiration of one-fourth of a second it will have reached approximately 1 foot from the initial point of release; whereas at the expiration of one-half second it will have reached 4 feet from the initial point of release, falling only 1 foot in the first quarter of a second, and with constantly increasing velocity, is finally falling with a velocity of 3 feet in a quarter of a second, virtually moving through three times the space in the last interval of time, which accelerated velocity is due to gravity. This establishes the axiom: "Fall is the factor that handles water." Conserve it, and utilize it, and you will find it a valuable assistant, as it will decrease the cost of culverts and drainage. Increasing the area of the cross section of a culvert is only obtained at an additional cost, and is neither advantageous nor economical. Carefully compiled tables can be obtained from various sources giving the exact capacity in gallons per minute of any size culvert pipe on stated fall per hundred feet. A study of these tables will convince the most skeptical that the capacity of a culvert is determined by the velocity or momentum of the water, rather than by the area of the cross section.

The velocity of water flowing on a fall of 36 inches to the hundred feet is approximately 22 miles per hour, while the velocity of water flowing on a fall of 1 inch to the hundred feet is only approximately 4 miles per hour.

In the construction of culverts, vitrified culvert pipe will prove to be the most convenient, durable, and economical whenever it can be used to accommodate the volume of storm water or run-off. Purged by the fires of the kilns of all that is volatile, and fused together by the intense heat to which it is subject, it is the density of glass, and has all the strength of steel, resisting the action of the elements, and enduring until the end of time. In the construction of culverts where one line of vitrified culvert pipe will not accommodate the run-off, two or more lines can be laid, so as to secure enough port of capacity to care for the storm water originating on the watershed. Care should be taken to utilize all the available fall, that the velocity may be secured to assist in handling the run-off. When the ground is level and the fall is slight, only a shallow ditch should be excavated on the upper side of the roadway or embankment, excavating the majority of the grading material from the lower ditch, which construction will increase or converse the existing fall, elevating the upper end of the culvert so as to obtain the greatest fall across the roadway. When two or more lines of pipe are required to secure enough capacity to accommodate the run-off, the best results are obtained by separating the lines of pipe when placed in the embankment, allowing a space of 4 or 5 feet between them, which will prevent them from being obstructed by floating debris. When the embankment will not permit the use of a large-size pipe, because sufficient cover can not be secured to protect it from travel, the same capacity can always be obtained with two or more pipes of equal area if the same fall be maintained through the embankment from upper to lower ditch.

Example: If only 12 inches of cover could be secured when using a 24-inch vitrified culvert pipe, a cover of 18 inches can be obtained by using two 18-inch pipes, as there is 6 inches less diameter. The area of a 24-inch pipe is 452 square inches, whereas the area of an 18-inch pipe is 254 square inches. The capacity of the two 18-inch pipes on any stated fall is approximately the same as the capacity of one 24-inch pipe on the identical fall. If the road builder desires to increase the run-off or capacity of the culvert, and can secure adequate cover, he can obtain 6 inches more fall or gradient across the roadway by the use of two 18-inch pipes rather than one 24-inch pipe, for the reason that the upper end of the 18-inch pipe can be elevated 6 inches above the flow line of the 24-inch pipe, and still secure the same cover. This will materially increase the velocity and consequent run-off and decrease the cost of handling the storm water. Do not forget that fall has a value, if utilized, that can be computed in dollars and cents; remember that increasing the velocity increases the capacity, and thereby decreases the size of the pipe required to handle a stated quantity of run-off or storm water.

Example: A 24-inch pipe on a fall of 1 inch to the 100 feet has a carrying capacity of 2,396 gallons per minute. Increase the fall to 36 inches to the 100 feet, and it will have a carrying capacity of 14,468 gallons per minute, which is over six times the capacity it had on 1 inch of fall. Under these conditions, if the fall can be obtained, the road builder could use one pipe in lieu of six at one-sixth the expense, which is evidence that fall has a money value, and is an economic factor in road construction. Nature bestows it lavishly at times, and again almost withholds it. If you will conserve and utilize it you will not find it so expensive to handle the storm water. We refer to vitrified culvert pipe particularly, for the reason that an established gradient can always be maintained and a fixed velocity secured whereby the capacity can always be accurately determined. When any other approved material is used in culvert construction, it is still imperative that fall receive due consideration to economically handle the run-off or storm water.

Substantial abutments of brick or stone masonry, or cement concrete, should be constructed at each end of the culvert when either vitrified pipe or other approved material is used for culvert construction.

On level bottom lands no excavation should be permitted to form a ditch on the upper side of the grade on embankment, as it will only provide a place for water to accumulate and stand, constantly seeping into and through the subbase. The better construction on such lands is to borrow all the material for the embankment from the lower ditch and wherever water is concentrated in depressions on the upper side of the embankment, provide and construct a culvert to secure a run-off into the lower ditch. If the embankment is high enough to insure a dry surface court of 18 inches to 24 inches and the run-off of the lower ditch secures sufficient drainage to keep it dry, a good road can be easily maintained.

In the construction of all grades longitudinal or lengthwise drainage must be maintained, so as to permit of run-off from the numerous ruts that occur at some seasons on steep grades or hillsides. "Thank-you-marms" or V-shaped obstructions should be constructed across the roadway at frequent intervals with the apex uphill to divert the water from the ruts to the ditches. On steep ascents no water should be permitted to pass over the embankment. The roadway should slope toward the hill and shed the water into the upper ditch, from which it should be permitted free exit through culverts under and through the embankment, to secure free run-off and prevent concentration and consequent erosion or washing out of upper ditch. This is usually secured by an obstruction in the form of a dam across the ditch immediately below the run-off culvert.

The embankment or grade should be constructed to secure free run-off of storm water and should consist of a berm on either side of

the roadway proper to support and sustain the spread of the roadway under travel.

Subdrainage should be appealed to where it becomes necessary to intercept a seep, or drain the sub-base, by lowering the water levels. Common porous drain tile is used exclusively for this purpose by engineers; the tile being laid in such manner as to drain into the lower ditch, where the end should be protected by an abutment.

Absolutely level gradients should never obtain in the construction of embankment on approximately level ground, but slight grades should be secured longitudinally to accelerate and secure run-off from the ruts produced by travel. This can always be accomplished by raising the grade of the embankment gradually from each side when a culvert is constructed, so that the culvert will be at the apex or summit of the grades.

This will prevent any holes and insure drainage of the surface of the roadway. Subsoils should be used in the construction of embankment and when complete the slopes and surface should receive a cover of the surface soils to encourage the growth of grass and prevent erosion of the surface by rut or the run-off of the storm water.

Light wash soil on dirt that is deposited in the draws or depression should never be used to construct an embankment. The usual method of construction of embankments by throwing all the grass, sod, and humus to the center of the roadway, where it becomes a storage for all the moisture it will retain, should be discontinued.

The relation of drainage to good road construction is so important that every little detail must be provided for to insure the stability and permanency of the construction of good roads. The skill of the most expert engineer is often taxed, and various experiments must be made before success is achieved and the work secured from damage or injury for want of proper drainage. Therefore the employment of the unskilled, uneducated, and inexperienced should be discontinued, and those placed in charge who are educated for the work.

Drainage is all there is to road building. This accomplished, and you have a good, dry road. What more could you ask for? Macadam! Eh? This is only a question of what your pocketbooks will stand for, but without drainage, macadam would be an extravagant waste of money, and ineffectual.

On the road to the creaking water mill,
Halting, the mud-burdened horses stand still;
In torrents and gusts pours the pitiless rain
On the roadway the boulder neglected to drain.
The driver said: "If I had a boat,
I could cross this flood,
But a wagon won't float."

GOOD ROADS.

[By Arthur C. Jackson, president National Good Roads Association.]

Fifty years ago Charles Sumner declared that "the two greatest forces for the advancement of civilization are the schoolmaster and good roads." There is an increasing multitude of people who believe that it is a matter of tremendous import that in the United States bad roads are directly responsible for the loss of over a billion dollars a year and that the saving of this stupendous sum constitutes an economic question of vast importance.

In the year 1890 the foundation of the National Good Roads Association was laid in a state good roads convention held at Kansas City, Mo. The subject of "Charities, correction, and good roads" was discussed by delegates from several States. The sentiment and resolution of that convention recommended to the governors of all States "That the increasing demands of charity for the defective classes and the tremendous increase of criminal arrests in the nation call for stringent vagrancy laws and their vigorous enforcement." Another resolution urgently requested "the cooperation of municipal, county, and state authorities to utilize the labor of able-bodied tramps, vagrants, paupers, and short term prisoners in public improvements."

It has been shown that such labor can be used economically and with good results on quarries, gravel pits, and rock piles in preparing the materials and loading it upon work trains or wagons and in the actual construction of roads and streets. Many States are now making substantial progress in road building with convicts. It is the aim of the National Good Roads Association to continue its agitation of the question until every commonwealth, municipality, and district community shall be awakened to its importance, enact suitable laws providing for this public work, and then see that these laws are enforced. At all times, and more especially during stringent periods, there is a large army of itinerant men who drift from State to State and who live by begging or stealing. They commit nearly every crime in the criminal calendar. Hundreds of thousands of this class are arrested annually, housed and fed and kept in idleness in jails or prisons at the expense of the honest toilers and taxpayers. This is a senseless crime against the State.

During the last nineteen years the Good Roads Associations have held over 2,000 county, state, and national good roads conventions. Vast quantities of literature have been distributed. The public press has printed thousands of pages, ever educating communities while advocating and urging good roads as a substantial asset and as a social and commercial necessity in the nation's expansion, contentment, and prosperity.

The Interstate Association was merged into the National Good Roads Association in convention at Chicago, November 21, 1900. Its objects were and are, first, to associate all who are in sympathy with the good roads movement in a universal demand for the permanent improvement of public roads and streets; second, to secure better results from the millions of dollars annually expended upon the public roads and streets; third, to have established in all States and Territories highway departments with practical engineering supervision; fourth, to secure thorough teaching of highway engineering in all universities and agricultural colleges; fifth, to utilize all able-bodied tramps, vagrants, paupers, prisoners, and convicts in preparing materials and building public roads and streets; sixth, to secure state and national aid for the construction and maintenance of permanent public roads for this and future generations.

On November 17, 1909, the following officers of the national association were elected: President, Arthur C. Jackson, president National Good Roads Congress; vice-president, F. A. Delano, president of the Wabash Railroad; secretary, H. W. McAfee, president of the Kansas State Good Roads Association; treasurer, Anna M. Grady, secretary and treasurer of the Illinois State Good Roads Association.

On May 23, 1908, the National Good Roads Congress was incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois to associate all interested in a national movement for good roads, and the following call was signed by the governors of 40 States and the mayors of more than 100

leading cities, convening the congress at Chicago June 15, 1908, and Denver July 6, 1908: "Recognizing a well-nigh universal sentiment in favor of better public highways, and believing that a general discussion of this great problem from every point of view will prove timely and effective, the undersigned join in urging all interested to attend the National Good Roads Congress at Chicago June 15, 1908, and Denver July 6, 1908, that the results of its deliberations may be presented for the consideration of the coming national conventions, all legislative bodies, and the public in general."

As a result of the congress, the Republican national convention at Chicago adopted the following good-roads plank in its platform: "We recognize the social and economic advantages of good country roads, maintained more and more largely at public expense and less and less at the expense of the abutting owner," and the Democratic national convention at Denver declared, "We favor federal aid to state and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post-roads."

The second National Good Roads Congress was held at Johns Hopkins University May 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1908, and in Washington, D. C., May 22, 1909. It was opened by Cardinal Gibbons and addressed by Vice-President Sherman, Speaker CANNON, Governor Crothers, and many of the most prominent men in public life. Among the resolutions adopted by this congress was one urging the construction by the National Government of a system of permanent national highways connecting the capital at Washington with the capitals of every State and Territory, and urging the several States to supplement these highways by another system of state roads to connect the several state capitals with the county seats of each State. It also favored the annual appropriation by the National Government of a certain percentage of the internal-revenue receipts for road construction and the loaning to States by the National Government, upon the application of the proper authorities, of money without interest for road building, the same to be repaid in annual installments. It also urged the immediate adoption of a postal savings-bank bill, in the confident belief that such a measure would yield abundant funds for a complete system of state and national highways.

The officers of the congress are the same as the national association, and the headquarters of both organizations are at Chicago, Ill.

OFFICE OF THE FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, December 7, 1909.

Mr. ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
President National Good Roads Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I have your kind invitation of the 4th instant to attend the Tenth National Good Roads Convention, for which I have to thank you, and to say that were it possible it would give me much pleasure to be with you at the meeting having for its object such an important subject as the improvement of roads, and one in which this bureau is so vitally interested, but owing to the pressure of public business, greatly to be augmented by the coming Congress, it will not be possible for me to leave Washington at the time mentioned.

With best wishes for a successful convention, and assuring you of my interest therein, I am,
Very truly, yours,

P. V. DE GRAW,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

P. S.—If the attached data will be of any use to you on the occasion of your convention, you are at liberty to make any use of them which you desire.

The interest which the Post-Office Department has in the good-roads movement, now generally active throughout the country, and in cooperating with road organizations and rural residents for the betterment of the public highways is the realization of the fact that good roads are essential to the efficiency of the rural delivery service in promoting reliable and uninterrupted delivery and collection of mail in rural communities.

It is a condition precedent to the establishment of rural delivery that the roads over which it is proposed to establish the service shall be in such condition as to be traveled with facility and safety at all seasons of the year, and the department insists that after the service is established the roads shall be maintained in good condition, so as to avoid delays and interruptions. There are now in operation throughout the United States 41,116 rural routes, which are costing \$37,500,000 per annum to maintain. Serving these routes are 41,006 rural letter carriers, all of whom, with but few exceptions, travel their routes daily, covering a total of about 1,000,000 miles a day and serving a rural population of about 20,000,000.

Without entering into a discussion of the economic and advantageous features of good roads, but dealing with the question solely in its relation to the postal service, the Post-Office Department is necessarily vitally interested in the improvement of the highways; for bad roads mean an impaired and unsatisfactory mail service and a severe hardship upon the thousands of rural letter carriers and the horses used by them, as well as a vast expense in repairing the wear and tear unavoidably resulting from poorly kept roads.

In the State of Kansas there are 1,771 rural routes of an average length of 27.09 miles. This means that the rural carriers in that State are required to travel nearly 48,000 miles of road a day, or 14,500,000 miles in the course of the year. Is it to be wondered at, then, that carriers complain when the roads are bad and that the department insists that they shall be kept in good condition for travel?

The excuse is sometimes given for a failure to keep up the roads that if they are good enough for those who reside on them they should be good enough for the carrier. These persons fail to appreciate the fact that while they are required to travel from 2 to 5 miles to the town where the post-office is located, and may go when they please and proceed leisurely, the rural carrier is required to travel his full route every week day, exclusive of certain holidays, and to maintain a fixed rate of travel.

For a half dozen years or more the Post-Office Department has been actively engaged in doing what it could within its limitations to secure the betterment of the highways throughout the country, in order to secure on each rural route the delivery of mail with certainty and celerity, and in response to the requirements of the service that the roads be kept up the department has received the hearty cooperation of state and local highway officials and good-roads clubs. The result of this cooperation has undoubtedly brought about a greater interest in the good-roads question, the building and rebuilding of more miles of good roads, and the intelligent expenditure of more money for good roads than any other one fact stimulating the good-roads movement. Hardly a day passes but that one can read of a state or local convention being held in behalf of good roads or some other movement being started to arouse the people to interest and activity in the matter, and

numerous invitations are received by the department for the attendance of some of its representatives at such conventions and meetings.

Illustrating the good and immediate results attained through the cooperation of the department which was extended to the Lancaster Automobile Club, of Lancaster County, Pa., in its efforts to secure the improvement of the highways, a letter has just been received by the department from the president of the club stating that within one year the club has succeeded in getting 300 road drags working on the roads in Lancaster County, to say nothing of the interest the subject has aroused, and that the result was achieved mostly because of the hearty cooperation of the rural letter carriers, and that as a result of the success obtained the Pennsylvania Good Roads Association has been formed to secure the improvement of the highways throughout the entire State.

The Post-Office Department is not only willing to cooperate, but will gladly lend all aid that may properly be given in furtherance of the good-roads movement, and desires that postmasters and rural letter carriers throughout the country interest themselves in the movement and give their active aid and cooperation as far as they may consistently do so.

P. V. DE GRAW.

Telegrams of indorsement from Senators, Members of Congress, and governors of States to good roads convention.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

HON. ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
President National Good Roads Convention, Topeka, Kans.:

I am heartily in favor of national aid for public dirt roads. For ages the Government has made appropriations for waterways and water transportation. For years Congress has donated millions of acres to railroads to encourage traffic by rail. Ninety per cent of the travelers are carried over dirt roads. It is high time that Congress display activity on the good-roads question. I rejoice at the activity of your organization, and I assure you of my heartiest cooperation.

SCOTT FERRIS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

HON. ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
Care State Capitol, Topeka, Kans.:

Sorry I can not be with you. Best wishes for the good-roads convention.

J. THOS. HEPLIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
State Capitol, Topeka, Kans.:

Permit me to join in greeting to your convention and express my interest in the movement of which it is the outgrowth.

MOSES E. CLAPP.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

PRESIDENT NATIONAL GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans.:

Letter just called to my attention. I beg to assure you of my interest and cooperation.

T. P. GORB.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
President National Good Roads Association, Topeka, Kans.:

Regret I can not attend the congress. Of course I feel a deep interest in every intelligent movement for good roads. The value of good roads can scarcely be estimated. I wish your meeting great success.

WM. J. STONE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14, 1909.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
President National Good Roads Association, Topeka, Kans.:

I take the deepest interest in the good roads movement and send you my cordial greetings and good wishes; there can be no more important international development than this improvement which will so greatly add to the productive power of the Nation or more substantially minimize waste in the delivery of its products. Please convey to the members of the congress my best wishes and assurance of my great interest in the purposes of the National Good Roads Convention.

ROBT. L. OWEN.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson, Miss., December 10, 1909.

Mr. H. W. MCAFEE,
Secretary National Good Roads Association, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 8th instant. I regret being unable to attend the national convention to be held on the 14th. I appointed delegates.

Good roads add greatly to the pleasure and profits of country life. They bring neighbors nearer together, nearer to market, nearer church, and enable them to make all their journeys quicker and better. All costs of transportation from farm to market, and market to farm, lessen the value of the products of the farm and the profit of its owner. Every reduction of this outlay is to be welcomed. The good roads movement in this State is of recent start, but is making rapid progress.

Very sincerely,

E. F. NOEL, Governor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON, *President, Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 7th instant, asking for an expression of my views on the question of national aid to public roads, to hand and noted. I beg to assure you that I am highly in favor of the Federal Government making large appropriations to aid the public roads of the country, provided the law is so guarded as not to interfere with the proper control by the States of such roads.

I am sorry that I will not be able to attend your convention. I have not made any speech in Congress on the subject, and those that I have made at our state and county good-roads meetings were extemporaneous, and I did not keep copies of them.

Very respectfully,

JOHN L. BURNETT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

ARTHUR C. JACKSON, *Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR SIR: I am encouraged and gratified to see that you are to hold a convention at Topeka, Kans., December 14 and 15, and wish it were in my power to be with you.

No more important movement could interest the American people than that of good roads. The problem of transportation is the great problem of the age. Transportation by railroad and by waterways has for many years had the active and generous support of the General Government. The importance of railroads and rivers and waterways is fully understood. The truth is good public roads, generally called "country roads," cut a much greater figure in the advancement of American civilization than any other single factor of transportation.

Good roads reach the homes of all the people. It is a direct benefit to every farmer, in every neighborhood, in every city throughout the Union.

Congestion of population in the cities of the United States seems to be generally considered one of the greatest dangers to American life. The army of the unemployed comes almost entirely from this congestion. The most practical as well as the most valuable way to arrest this movement from the country to the city is the development of country roads.

So accept my congratulations upon your activity, and best wishes for the success of this great undertaking.

Yours, very truly,

GEO. W. TAYLOR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U. S.,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

HON. ARTHUR C. JACKSON, *President, etc., Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR SIR: I am very much in favor of any rational good roads movement and will be delighted to do what I can to help it along. I was born and reared in Kentucky, where they have the best roads in the world, and have spent nearly all my manhood days in Pike County, Mo., where they have 200 miles of the finest graveled roads in the country. Consequently I am in a situation to appreciate good roads and am happy to say that in every county in my district they are building rock roads and gravel roads and greatly improving the dirt roads. I wish you may have a happy and successful meeting.

Very truly, yours,

CHAMP CLARK.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

Mr. ARTHUR C. JACKSON, *President, Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 7th instant received. I am heartily in favor of good roads in the United States, and especially approve the action of the various States to secure them. Our State is doing considerable in that direction now, although it has just started the improvement. In some of the Eastern States the progress made has been very flattering and general, and a great improvement will be found in the roads of these States. I am specially interested in the repair of roads already completed. This part of the work has not yet seemed to have reached perfection in our own State and in many others, and without efficient repair, of course, good roads will prove a failure.

While I am in favor of road building by the States, I am utterly opposed to road building by the National Government. We are going as far in that direction as we ought to in making experiments in trying to advise the States as to the proper construction of the roads.

Yours, very truly,

SERENO E. PAYNE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

Mr. ARTHUR C. JACKSON, *Chicago, Ill.*

ESTEEMED SIR: I am just in receipt of your favor in which it is stated that I am urged to send your office a communication to be read at the approaching Tenth Good Roads Convention to be held at Topeka, Kans., on the 14th and 15th instant, and I hasten to reply to say that my duties as a Member of Congress for the next few days will not permit me to take time to prepare a paper upon the subject, and hence I will content myself by saying that I am deeply interested in the cause of improving the roads of our country, and stand ready to vote for an appropriation for that purpose at the earliest opportunity. The farmers support the world, and they ought to have the very best roads possible to haul the products of the farm that they support the world upon to market. Your cause has one "friend in court" at this time, if no more.

With very best wishes for the success of the approaching convention, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

R. B. MACON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1909.

The National Good Roads Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I submit a statement of my position on this great question.

Truly, yours,

T. T. ANSBERRY.

"The question of good roads is one that takes us back as far as history has preserved a record, and this because the cost of transportation of any product of the farm or factory or mine or taken from the depths of the sea goes a long way to make up the sum total of the cost of the particular article, and therefore has a great deal to do with the personal economy of every household. For all these things or most of them had to be, and now many of them must be, hauled over the highways, and the relation that good roads bear to the cost of living is thus shown to be very close.

"The grangers of the country, however, had this question brought more directly to them, because they had to use the highways to travel back and forth from plantation or farm to the market, and they suffered the personal inconvenience incumbent upon one who is compelled daily to travel over poor roads; result, agitation for good roads, first, purely local, and now it is one of the greatest questions before the American people, and I doubt if you can find a legislator or a taxpayer who is not favorably disposed toward this great movement without much reckoning the cost. I am glad to say that the State of Ohio has taken a long step in the right direction in recent legislation on this subject, and the National Agricultural Department has devoted much of its money and time to construct model roads out of the materials nature has left near by, and the department should have the encouragement of all. I favor this subject, and shall do all in my power to promote it."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
Guthrie, December 11, 1909.

Mr. H. W. MCAFEE,
Secretary National Good Roads Association, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 8th instant, I am in hearty accord with Governor Stubb's call for the good roads meeting, and I am sending a full list of delegates to participate.

I regret exceedingly that as December 15 is the opening day for the sale of school land at Chandler, Okla., which I must necessarily attend, that I will be compelled to miss this meeting myself, but you can mark me as being in full sympathy with Governor Stubb's idea.

Sincerely, yours,

C. N. HASKELL, Governor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, December 13 1909.

Hon. ARTHUR C. JACKSON,
President National Good Roads Association, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate the association on the splendid work it is doing. The programme of improvement, construction, and maintenance of public roads is bound to absorb the interests of our people in every section. This will become more apparent with the increase of population and the consequent enlarging of social and industrial expansion.

The social and commercial life of the great agricultural sections will be vastly improved by a system of good roads. The producers can market their products more easily and the commercial centers can distribute their goods in exchange to the greater advantage of all. The farmer and his family will make more frequent visits to the village centers; social intercourse among neighbors will be encouraged; the farm will have a greater earning power because of shortened distances to markets, schools, and churches; population between country and city will be more equally distributed, and thus will help to relieve the congested centers. Indifference to the movement will finally be turned into active support when we begin to realize the advantages to come from improved systems of roads.

I am deeply interested in the system of improved roads, and I trust that splendid results will follow from your meeting and that you will be able to propagate the educational programme to all parts of our country.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN A. MAGUIRE, M. C.

Address of F. A. Delano, president Wabash Railroad and the American Railway Association, vice-president National Good Roads Association, read at Tenth National Good Roads Association Convention, Topeka, Kans., December 14 and 15, 1909.

It is commonly said that all men act from interested motives, and the public usually assumes that of a man representing a corporation this is especially true. Statements of this kind may be made in a tone of cynicism and disparagement where they carry a bad impression and "leave a bad taste in the mouth." On the other hand, there is a sense in which it is true. A man may act for himself or for a corporation which he represents from a narrowly selfish motive, or he may act selflessly but in a very farseeing way which represents a highly enlightened self-interest. It is the duty of the president of a railroad corporation, as trustee for the owners of the property, to conserve the interests of his company, and in view of the fact that the courts have determined that a railroad is a quasi public corporation it follows that the officer of a railroad is a quasi public official. It is clearly his duty, therefore, to keep in touch with public interests, with the needs of the communities along his line, and to seek in every way to develop those interests. The most intelligent railroad official recognizes that in developing the industrial growth of the communities along the railroad he is rendering the highest possible service to the corporation he represents. It is in this sense, therefore, and in this sense only, that I feel entirely justified in appearing upon this platform.

I will touch very briefly on the problems which are to come up before this congress and which will be presented to you very fully and clearly as the session proceeds.

I. THE GROWTH OF THE POPULATION.

The population of the United States is now increasing at the rate of about 1,500,000 per year. This is 1,000,000 due to immigration and a half a million due to excess of births over deaths. As has been pointed out a great many times, with this enormous and constant increase in population and with no increase in our area, it is evident that it will not be long before every acre of land will be in demand.

II. THE TENDENCY TOWARD CENTRALIZATION IN CITIES.

Everyone appreciates that the tendency toward centralization in cities has been very marked in recent years. You probably know that during the administration of President Roosevelt a commission was appointed to investigate this subject and see in what way life on the farm could be made more agreeable and so counteract this tendency. Railroads are interested on both sides of this question and are therefore fairly in a position to look at it impartially. The cities through which they run are growing with great rapidity, and the growth in business originating at those cities is more rapid than the growth in business at the smaller country stations, but this is not an unmixed benefit to the railroads. The growth of the cities produces a condition of affairs which involves perhaps the most serious problem in railroad management—the problem of furnishing sufficient and adequate terminal facilities in the large cities and still keeping the cost of transportation down within moderate limits. The passenger terminal expense in one of our large eastern cities amounts to 25 cents for every passenger handled through the terminal; in another city it is 20 cents; in another 47 cents, and so on, these terminal expenses alone being more than the total fare collected on a large percentage of the short-distance travel.

Furthermore, as every farseeing railroad man knows, the railways are absolutely dependent on the well-being of the entire community. Congestion in large cities means high rents; high rents mean high wages; deficient productivity of the farms means high cost of farm productions, high cost of living for the man who lives in the city, and that again means higher wages and higher cost of railway operation.

This brings me to the third great proposition, viz:

III. PRODUCTIVITY OF THE SOIL.

Jonathan Swift (called "Dean Swift"), writing two hundred years ago, said: "Whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together." It is interesting to note what has been done along this line. In very arid regions much has been done by irrigation and dry farming. In swampy regions much has been done by proper methods of diking and draining. But for the great percentage of our fair land very little has been done in the direction of increasing the productivity, and what is far worse, the development in many cases has been just in the opposite direction. In other words, we have cropped the soil without any thought of the most simple and well-known rules of crop rotation. We have made little attempt to return to the soil the valuable elements which have been taken from it, and only in very recent years have we gone scientifically to work to find out just what the soil lacked to make it highly productive. The agricultural departments of our Western States, our universities, and our schools of agriculture have done most excellent work in this respect, as you will hear later from some of the speakers; but, at the same time, as we look over the work that has been done and consider what yet remains to be done, we feel that we have only "scratched the surface"—that we have only just begun to do our full duty.

DECENTRALIZATION.

I have already spoken of the tendency toward centralization of the population in our cities and the importance of working toward decentralization. The railroads have tried to help this movement in various ways. One is by the familiar method of some-seekers' excursions, low rates from cities to farm lands, advertising farm lands, etc. The railroads have favored and, I think, should continue to help in any proper way they can anything which will tend to improve and ameliorate the condition of the farmer. I do not mean to say for a minute that the farmer needs any sympathy or commiseration. In the States of the Mississippi Valley farm lands have, generally speaking, doubled in value in the last ten years. Furthermore, during the whole of this time, conditions of life on the farm have materially improved. But, despite this, we see the tendency of the farmer to come to the cities and farmers' boys and girls giving up life on the farm. The argument most frequently cited in explanation of this is that man is by nature a gregarious animal, and that the loneliness of farm life is driving men and women to towns and cities. There is undoubtedly a good deal in this; but at the same time it is recognized that greater comforts on the farm, as well as convenient means of communication with neighbors, will do a great deal toward ameliorating these conditions. The bicycle and the farm telephone have already done much. The automobile will do more. Good state and county roads will do still more.

IX. THE COST OF GETTING FARM PRODUCTS TO MARKET.

The Bureau of Commerce and Labor, in a bulletin issued some time ago, pointed out that it cost the farmer in many States more to get his products to the railroad station than it did to pay freight charges on the products to the market in which he sold them. Undoubtedly this is not true in all the States; for example, in the State of Illinois, having the largest railroad mileage of any State in the Union except Texas, only 2 per cent of the entire area of the State is more than 8 miles away from a railroad track; but assuming that the statement is correct as to many States, it is obvious that if we can reduce the cost to the farmer of getting his products to the railroad station, it will be just as effective to him as reducing railroad rates. The cost of hauling on a country road is assumed by a number of authorities to be 20 cents per ton per mile. This is about 30 times the average railroad freight rate on all classes of business the country over and about 60 times the freight rate which applies on low-grade bulk commodities over a greater part of our country. In other words, the cost of hauling coal or brick or sand or grain or cotton on our average country roads is about the same for a distance of 12 miles as the freight charge for a distance of 200 miles, which is approximately the average haul of freight on railroads in the United States. Good roads are just as important to the farmer as low freight rates; and the value of farm products on the farm is the value of that produce in our central markets, less the cost of gathering on the farm, the cost of wagoning to the railroad station, the cost of transportation to market, and anything which will reduce or tend to reduce these costs will increase the value of those farm products to the farmer in just that proportion.

X. THE SHARE OF TAXATION PAID BY RAILROADS.

In the aggregate the railroads of the country pay, in round figures, \$85,000,000 taxation; or, as near as I can figure it, 10 per cent of the total taxes of the country. In some States this is more and in some less. Hence, when any railroad official advocates general improvements, such as the betterment of state and county roads out of the general expenses, it is with recognition that a large share of the cost of this work will fall upon the railroads. Here again the merely selfish view would be not to advocate any such improvements because of the resultant expenditure. From the standpoint of a more enlightened self-interest, it seems to me we are justified in advocating such improvements, feeling assured that the community as a whole will be very much benefited and that the railroads will be certain to share in that benefit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by my colleague is so clearly in the nature of new legislation, and therefore obnoxious to the rule, that I am compelled to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is new legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries in regard to systems of road management throughout the United States and for giving expert advice on this subject, \$16,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 60, line 23, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not offer this amendment for the sole purpose of making a speech on it, but I propose to make a short one, by the courtesy of the committee, nevertheless. I want also to give notice that in addition to this amendment I will offer an amendment to the next paragraph in this bill, to increase the amount appropriated thereby from \$43,000 to \$75,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to preface what I have to say on this subject by three propositions. In the first place, I insist that no one in this House can find any authority in the Constitution of the United States for building a post-office in any community of this land which will not with equal force apply to the building of post-roads. In the second place, I make the statement that there is no highly civilized country on earth with as poor roads, upon the average, as ours. In the third place, I insist that the present movement or propaganda in favor of better roads in this country began soon after the establishment of this bureau, and that its work, more than any other one influence, has fostered that propaganda.

I submit, with reference to the first proposition, that for ninety years there has been no substantial doubt expressed as to the right of Congress, its constitutional right, to legislate for the establishment of post-roads, and I venture to make this assertion, although I believe it will surprise some of the Members of the House, that there has never been a decade in the history of the country, beginning with 1806, when the first appropriation was made by Congress to promote what was known as "the Cumberland road," or that part of the old national road extending from Cumberland, Md., to Wheeling, Va., when as little money has been appropriated or granted by Congress under this provision of the Constitution as has been appropriated within the last decade. In spite of the fact that within that time a Bureau, or Office, of Good Roads has been established, if you will divide all that has been appropriated or granted, directly or indirectly, by Congress for the promotion and "establishment of post-roads" in this country by 9—that is, the last ninety years—I venture to say that the lowest decade will be found to be the last.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman include in that all of the money that has been expended by the War Department in the construction of military roads throughout the United States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman will have another guess coming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think not. That was all done, or substantially all done, in one or two decades.

Mr. MANN. I mean the last ten years. We have spent more money some years on military roads in the last few years than we have ever spent before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, the gentleman himself has "another guess coming." I do not mean appropriations for highway and wagon roads, but I mean, as I said, granted or appropriated under that provision of the Constitution which enables this Government to establish and improve the "post-roads" of the country, under which, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], all of the enormous land grants were made to the railroads of the West, and they were made under no other authority. The "general-welfare" clause of the Constitution was appealed to, but it was universally admitted that the only authority under which, beginning in the State of Indiana or Illinois and going straight west to the Pacific coast, we granted great quantities of land to the railroads was that simple clause of the Constitution which enables the General Government to establish post-offices and post-roads. I do not propose to discuss further that phase of the subject, because I take it for granted that it is substantially admitted.

Neither do I intend to dwell upon the historical aspect of the subject, interesting as that has always been to me. As matter of fact, as I have said, beginning with the first appropriation of 1806 for the Cumberland road, there never has been a year, or rather no long period of years, in which appropriations have not been made for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, as I will make both of my speeches on this and the next paragraph at one time, if permitted, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for ten minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, make it five minutes.

Mr. MANN. There is no need of the gentleman's talking on the next paragraph, because I am going to make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious to finish this bill this afternoon and, much as I regret it, I shall have to object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman in charge of this bill, in view of the fact that he permitted this afternoon political speeches for half an hour, should now make objection. I ask, then, with the consent of the chairman of Committee on Agriculture, unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I contend that this and the next paragraph provide for what is essentially the most valuable work of this bureau. The language of this paragraph is "for inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States and for giving expert advice on the subject;" and the next paragraph provides for investigations of the best methods of road making and for giving expert advice on that subject. I submit to the House that this work of this bureau comes directly within the definition of the gentleman from Kentucky of the proper function of the Government, to which I have heretofore referred on the floor of this House, namely, that this work relates to "the fundamentals" of this matter. Much as I would like personally to see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, which was ruled out of order, ruled to be in order or made a law, so that the General Government might financially assist in the actual construction of roads, at the same time that is much beyond what is here proposed. This appropriation is to help do what? And I ask if the money of this Government can be devoted to a better purpose than doing what it is here proposed to do, namely, to teach the people of each community by expert advice two things, each of them absolutely essential to their having good roads in their communities.

The first is the best way to manage their roads, and the second is the method of making the best roads that can be made out of the materials they have. I submit to the committee that there is nothing the Government can do more valuable than this. Anybody can make a good road out of crushed limestone. Anybody having plenty of good crushed limestone can grade up a little ridge, put on the crushed limestone, and make a good road. But the point is for the people throughout the country to learn to make the best roads that can be made out of the material they have, and then manage them most advisably, and this is what it is here proposed to do.

Just think of it! "For inquiries and for giving expert advice," \$16,000. I suppose that the gentleman in charge of the bill will suggest, as he did a few moments ago, it would be "appalling" to increase it to \$25,000. I am just a little tired of this use of that word. The Government is going to be swamped by an appropriation which extends the work of any bureau, for the obvious reason that this House can stop appropriating when it pleases. We make appropriations for these purposes every year, and surely an increase of this appropriation for making inquiries as to the best way of managing our roads and giving expert advice upon the subject to \$25,000, and to increase the amount for experiments in reference to the use of materials for making roads, and giving advice upon that subject to \$75,000, can not be considered a very serious increase so far as the revenues of the country are concerned, and yet it will be at least a step in the right direction.

The importance of the subject it would be hard to overstate. It is estimated that there are in this country some two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty thousand miles of road over which the Government in the rural delivery service is today actually carrying the mails. That service has unquestionably come to stay. It is one of the most useful and valuable of all the functions of the Government. It is being, as it ought to be, constantly extended; and the time is coming, I sincerely hope is not far off, when in the more thickly settled portions of our land every dweller in the rural districts will have his newspaper and his mail delivered to him daily. The increase of this service necessarily must go hand in hand with the improvement of the rural highways. But far beyond and above the value of good roads to the Government itself is their value as a civilizing agency. I can not do better in this connection than to quote the language that I find in the brief on this

subjected submitted to Congress by the National Good Roads Association. In speaking of good roads the writer says:

There is no use in making an argument as to the value of good roads. They economize time, labor, and money; save worry, waste, and force; they aid the social and religious advancement of the people; they increase the value of property and aid every avocation, and especially that of agriculture; they mean the ability at all times to move a maximum burden at a minimum cost; they permit the transportation of marketable products during bad weather, when no work can be done on the farm; they save the wear and tear on horses, drivers, harness, and wagons. Good roads are the avenues of progress; the best proof of intelligence; the ligaments that bind the country together in the bonds of patriotism and thrift; they are the woof of sentiment woven into the great web of our civilization; they are to the body politic what the venous system is to the human body. Without it stagnation and decay follow; with it all forms of growth, strength, and beauty prevail. Good roads are the initial fountains of commerce, the rivulets that swell the great streams that flow out of every country and distribute the products of our fields, factories, forests, and mines. They will do more to extend trade and commerce of the country, will add more to the happiness, intelligence, and prosperity of the people, and will contribute more to their social elevation and moral strength than any other material thing whatever.

It seems to me but a matter of justice that the rural districts of the country should receive from the General Government, if not direct financial aid in the building of roads wherever the rural mails are carried over them, certainly every help that the Government can extend in this regard. I have spoken before of the enormous proportion of our revenues spent upon preparation for war and in payment for past wars, amounting to more than two-thirds of the total revenues of the Government. In addition we are spending vast sums on the improvement of rivers and harbors, which may indirectly, but certainly do not directly, benefit the dwellers in the rural districts far from where these improvements are made. In these districts the matter of good roads is of paramount importance; and I therefore appeal again, as I have appealed before, to the Committee on Agriculture to increase and ever increase the appropriations for this branch of the Government's activities. The bureau known as the "Office of Roads" receives in this bill but \$114,000. I would like to see one experiment station, at least, in every congressional district in the land—a station where, as I have said, the people of every community can be taught by scientific men and experts in road making how to make the best roads out of the material at hand. In some parts of the country this has been done with great success, and I can see no reason why the Government can not and should not extend this work in every direction and why we should not, as Representatives of the people and of the whole people, gladly increase appropriations along these lines.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, and I believe that this committee and the Committee on Agriculture both are in sympathy with the purposes of his amendment. I want, however, to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to this fact, that a committee charged with the responsibility of recommending appropriations, if it does its duty to itself, the House, and the country, must make its recommendations in accordance with the condition of the revenues at the time being. We should not overappropriate, and we have been told from time to time we are facing a depleted Treasury; that the expenses and extravagances of this Government are taking more than the revenues can meet; and it is true, and in this connection I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that he himself personally and as a member of a great party is responsible for this condition of the Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have most carefully watched the course of the gentleman during the progress, slow as it is, through the committee, and I presume, Mr. Chairman, that he marked it out for himself, for the reason that he wished to make the pending proposition to the House, else his course would appear most inconsistent, because during the general discussion, when the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas, was speaking, the gentleman from Ohio gave us to understand that he had commissioned and dedicated himself to the great purpose of standing by the great American farmer in the consideration of this bill. It did my heart good, in the consideration of this bill, first, when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Macon] gave us to understand that he had given it a clean bill of health. It did my heart good because I believe in the farmer and know his need, representing, as I do, an agricultural district, when the gentleman from Ohio gave us later to understand that he had commissioned himself to see to it that the farmers should get a fair deal at the hands of Congress. You can imagine my surprise, Mr. Chairman, to find that when we of the South were battling here for two days for an increase in the appropriation for meeting the ravages of the boll weevil, an insect that threatens one of the greatest industries of this country, an industry upon which depends in such a large measure the cloth-

ing supply of the Nation and of the entire world, to find my friend from Ohio voting against that proposition—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In just one minute. When the battle was at its very crisis, and the contending forces were surging forward and backward; when everything was in the balance, I listened with my hand to my ear to hear a bugle blast fill the air, for I knew if I heard it, it would be sounded by the gentleman from Ohio rushing to the defense of the farmers of this country; but, gentlemen, the bugle never blared. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield in just a moment. Again, when I saw my friend from Tennessee [Mr. Houston] offer an amendment the purpose of which was to increase the appropriation for the teaching of agriculture throughout the country, I listened once more for the blare of the bugle from Ohio, and she did not blare. And then—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the gentleman from South Carolina have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman from South Carolina will be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I saw the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Martin] offer an amendment to increase the appropriation for semiarid work, and again I listened for the bugle blare, intently, seriously, earnestly, almost prayerfully, but she did not blare. I thought to myself the gentleman from Ohio must have had a purpose in mind else I should be spared this painful silence, and it is disclosed to-day. He has held back the blare of his bugle in order to raise it in the interest of good roads. And for what better purpose could he raise it? We are in sympathy with him. This committee is in sympathy with him. The Committee on Agriculture is in sympathy with him.

The chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott], is just as much an advocate of that proposition as is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Douglas], but the gentleman from Kansas knows that the edict has gone forth that appropriations must be pared to the very bone, because the Treasury will not stand for them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, Mr. Chairman? Because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Douglas] and the gentlemen across this aisle have been piling for years and years Pelion on Ossa, extravagances in appropriations, which make it impossible for us to appropriate now even in a reasonable degree for the great cause of agriculture. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Douglas] in his colloquy with the chairman of the committee makes the use of this declaration, which would give the country to understand that he stood here against the appropriation for the building of battle ships and for those for the Agricultural Department. Here is the gentleman's statement:

Does the gentleman doubt that, instead of building two battle ships this year, if we added \$5,000,000 to the appropriation for the various useful bureaus of the Department of Agriculture that Secretary Wilson would be able to spend the money wisely and judiciously?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but just for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am going to ask you a question. Do you know what you are reading from?

Mr. LEVER. I am reading from your speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. About what?

Mr. LEVER. About the agricultural appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was a speech in favor of giving to this House a chance to look over the whole field of appropriations, and it was on a resolution that I offered.

Mr. LEVER. Let it be born in mind, gentlemen of this committee—

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is only used by way of illustration.

Mr. LEVER. Let it be borne in mind, no matter what the purposes were, that the country got the idea, perhaps the mistaken idea, I am glad to have the gentleman say, that he stood here against appropriations for a large navy because that meant that we could not make large appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I was interested to know, and this committee may be interested to know, that the gentleman from Ohio is on record in the last session of Congress, the Sixtieth Congress, in favor of a two battle-ship proposition. And yet here we are. We would like to increase this appropriation. We are all in sympathy with it. We know the purposes are good, but, gentlemen, these battle ships have put the Treasury in such a condition that we can not do it in justice to the Treasury.

Therefore, feeling my responsibility as a Member of this House and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, charged with the duty of recommending appropriations, much as I dislike to do it, I shall have to vote against the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio because his action and the action of his party have made it necessary for me and my party to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADISON rose.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my colleague yield to me to request that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in ten minutes?

Mr. MADISON. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate end in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT].

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I heard a gentleman who was sitting behind me a short time ago make the statement that he had heard a great many remarks upon this floor in the way of criticism, but he had very seldom seen any Member rise for the purpose of saying something in commendation of anybody or anything. I am only going to take a minute or two of the time of the committee, and I want to take it for the purpose of saying something in commendation of the work of the Good Roads Office. I do not believe that there is a bureau in all the great departments of the Government that under all the circumstances has rendered greater service to the country during its existence than this one. I speak at first hand in regard to the matter, because my people have been the beneficiaries of the work of this bureau. It was stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the main purpose that this bureau accomplished was in teaching people how to build good roads. He ought to have gone a little further than that and have said they do that by the best means of instruction; that is, object-lesson roads. They send men all over the United States into communities where the road problem is a serious one and solve for them the problem of good roads.

We have more natural good roads in Kansas, perhaps, than in any other State in the Union, but we are confronted in a number of localities with the sand-road problem; and any person who has ever attempted to drive over a sand road understands what it means. Put a range of sand hills between two communities, and it almost isolates one from the other. South of the Arkansas River in Kansas there are ranges of sand hills, and the towns to the north have been almost cut off from those to the south by reason of the sand hills. These men from the Office of Public Roads have gone out in these communities and have instructed these people how to build a sand-clay road that gives them a durable, a permanent road, one that stands up under heavy traffic, and at a cost of about \$1,000 a mile. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that it is a remarkable thing, and the results that have been accomplished in these communities have been simply of incalculable benefit. I simply rise in my place to say this word of commendation of the Good Roads Office.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. MADISON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask you how much you propose shall be carried in this bill—\$15,000?

Mr. MADISON. I do not hear the gentleman plainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And there are about 400 Members in the House.

Mr. MADISON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have in my district 48 counties. That would give me about 80 cents and a fraction for each one of them; and if it is to cost \$1,000 a mile to build one of these roads, how far would that 80 cents go? [Laughter.]

Mr. MADISON. The gentleman assumes that I am against the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It might fill up one hole somewhere.

Mr. MADISON. Is the gentleman assuming that I am opposed to the increase in the appropriation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADISON. I do not know that I understood the gentleman from Texas. I could not hear him distinctly. I did not say these roads were built at government expense. The local communities furnish the money; the employees of the bureau teach

the people how to build the roads, and they supervise the building of model roads, but not with the money of the Government.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I reserved only one minute for myself to close this debate, because I do not think it is necessary to consume any time in speaking to the amendment. I only asked for this one minute because the gentleman from Ohio seemed to be seriously offended when in the plain exercise of my right and, as I believed, in accord with the wish of the House I objected to extending his time exceeding five minutes, and he stated in a tone of reproach that I had yielded half an hour early in the day to a political discussion. He is mistaken in that statement. I yielded only ten minutes to political debate, five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] and five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COLE], because both are members of the Committee on Agriculture; and I did not wish to seem discourteous to them.

Touching the pending amendment, I desire merely to remind the House that within the past five years this appropriation has grown from \$37,000 to \$100,000, and the committee believes the amount in the current law will be amply sufficient to carry forward the work that must be done during the coming year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I move to strike out the last word, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to print in the Record a document entitled "Corporation-Tax Circular No. 2" of "the Illinois Manufacturers' Association." I wish to read but one or two sentences from it, to show gentlemen of the House what it purports to be. It is headed, "Repeal the corporation-tax law—Quick action on your part will produce the result." Then it goes on to say:

Fully 60 per cent of the Members of Congress believe the corporation-tax law is unjust, inquisitorial, and discriminatory. Fully 40 per cent are ready to vote now for its repeal.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course, debate is really out of order. I have no objection to giving the gentleman unanimous consent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am perfectly willing, I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. My point of order is made for the purpose of preventing a protracted political debate in the House.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have no intention of making a political speech at all or leading up to a political debate.

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw the point of order, as far as the gentleman is concerned.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I thank the gentleman. I merely want to call the attention of the House to this sort of propaganda. The entire circular is as follows:

Corporation-Tax Circular No. 2.

ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, January 22, 1910.

REPEAL THE CORPORATION-TAX LAW.

QUICK ACTION ON YOUR PART WILL PRODUCE THE RESULT.

Fully 60 per cent of the Members of Congress believe the corporation-tax law is unjust, inquisitorial, and discriminatory. Fully 40 per cent are ready to vote now for its repeal.

The returns received at this office in reply to our letter of January 6 indicate the foregoing facts, and are encouraging. Please write your Senators and Congressmen again and urge action. Bring to their attention that they are under more obligation to their constituents than they are to the administration. Point out that the administration can give them no votes in the districts in which they reside.

Please send a contribution for \$25, or such amount as you care to contribute, unless you have already contributed, to aid in the campaign. It takes postage and printing to bring this matter to the attention of all the corporations in the United States.

The conference called under the auspices of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association in this city Friday, January 14, was a great success. Do you want a copy of the proceedings? It will be mailed upon request.

Subjoined is a copy of the resolutions, a list of the committee named to conduct the campaign, and copies of the repealing measure offered by Congressman SOUTHWICK, of Albany, and the bill to extend the time introduced by Congressman COUDREY, of St. Louis.

JOHN M. GLENN, Secretary.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas at a conference of representatives of corporate industries, commercial organizations representing various sections of the country, and individual corporations, held at Chicago, Ill., on the 14th day of January, 1910, under the auspices of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, the corporate-tax law of August 5, 1909, has been carefully discussed and considered from every standpoint; and

Whereas the representatives of this conference are of the unanimous opinion that this law, as framed, is inimical not only to the interests of those represented but to the country at large, as being at variance with established rights and principles, and especially as infringing upon the domain of the sovereignty of the various States, as discriminating between individuals operating as individuals and those operating through corporate bodies, as granting to the Federal Congress the right, by and through a tax on corporate operations, to find a means to create

revenues which might lead to excessive government expenditures, and especially obnoxious by reason of the publicity which the law would give to corporate business as opposed to that which is carried on by partnerships and individual enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the unqualified indorsement of this conference be given to the efforts which are being made for the absolute repeal of this act; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this conference pledge themselves to exercise their utmost endeavor to secure the cooperation of other bodies and other interests toward such repeal; that every member of this conference pledge himself to bring all possible influence to bear upon the various Members of Congress to secure such repeal: Be it further

Resolved, That pending this repeal of the act as a whole Congress be requested and urged to immediately abolish the publicity feature of the law, which is unfair, discriminatory, and unjust: Be it further

Resolved, That a committee of 11 be appointed by the chairman of this conference to devise ways and means with full power to carry out the spirit of these resolutions and test the constitutionality of the law, if deemed advisable.

La Verne W. Noyes, Illinois Manufacturers' Association, chairman, Chicago; A. P. Nevin, National Association Manufacturers, New York; J. H. Beek, St. Paul Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, St. Paul; W. A. Roberts, Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg; William O. Matthews, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland; Frederic C. McDuffie, Arkwright Club, Boston; W. B. Martin, Iowa State Manufacturers' Association, Dubuque; T. Jas. Fernley, National Hardware Association, Philadelphia; Melville W. Mix, Manufacturers' Bureau of Indiana, Mishawaka; W. P. Wagner, Green Bay Business Men's Association, Green Bay, Wis.; Geo. M. Gillette, Minnesota Employers' Association, Minneapolis; L. C. Blanding, Tri-City Manufacturers' Association, Moline, Ill.,

Committee.

REPEALING MEASURES.

Please demand that corporations be given an immediate hearing on these bills by the Committee on Ways and Means, and refuse to be side-tracked or flagged by any talk looking to delay or by the assertion that nothing can be done.

Sixty-first Congress, second session.

In the House of Representatives, December 14, 1909, Mr. SOUTHWICK introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 14545) to repeal the corporation-tax law.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 38 of the act of August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sixty-first Congress, second session.

In the House of Representatives, January 10, 1910, Mr. COUDREY introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 17504) amending the corporation-tax law.

Be it enacted, etc., That article 3 of the corporation-tax law be amended in such form as to extend the time allowed for filing schedules and returns from the 1st day of March, 1910, to the 1st day of May, 1910, and the 1st day of May in each year thereafter.

SEC. 2. That article 6 of the corporation-tax law is hereby repealed and the following substituted in lieu thereof:

"When the assessment shall be made, as provided in this section, the returns, together with any corrections thereof which may have been made by the commissioner, shall be filed in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I did not understand from whom this is.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is a circular issued by the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and has in it the names of the members of a committee, made up from a number of States, to constitute a national campaign committee. Now, I do not know the amount of this campaign fund that is referred to or what it might be. If every corporation in the country contributed \$25, I assume that it would amount to a good many million dollars. The only comment I care to make now is to suggest to gentlemen that it is not at all extraordinary that they are receiving nowadays a large number of letters from corporations in their districts.

I have only one more word to say. I am glad to be able to state that all men interested in corporations and men of large affairs are not of this same mind. I desire to read a letter written by a constituent of mine in reply to this circular. The writer of this letter is one of the largest men of affairs in the city of Cincinnati and a man largely interested in corporations. He says:

Mr. JOHN M. GLENN,

Secretary Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: In answer to a circular signed by you on behalf of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, I beg to say, for our company, that we are not in sympathy with the movement of your association, nor do we believe it to be patriotic or wise; therefore we do not contribute. We believe that the support of the administration will be more advantageous to the people of the United States than the point which you make, that Senators and Congressmen should be influenced as a matter of being more under obligations to their constituents than they are to the administration. We are convinced that the business of the United States should pay toward the support of the Government. As to whether this corporation tax is equitable is not the question just now.

JANUARY 27, 1910.

It is a means which has been adopted, and if it is not equitable it should be modified so as to be an equitable assessment on all business. We do not believe in your campaign.

Very respectfully, yours,

LUCIEN WULSIN,
President.

I do not intend to discuss the merits of the corporation tax at this time. I shall probably take occasion to do so later. I have risen to-day merely to call the attention of the House and of the country to the methods that some corporations are taking to force a repeal of the corporation tax before it has an opportunity to demonstrate its value, before even its constitutionality has been passed upon by the courts.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the best methods of road making and the best kinds of road-making materials throughout the United States and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, \$43,000.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. In view of the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOUGLAS] to increase the amount, I am inclined to make the point of order, although I am somewhat shaken in that determination because of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio seems to be alone in the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this is one of the few items in the bill where there has been a considerable increase in the appropriation over that made last year.

Mr. SCOTT. The total appropriation for the Office of Public Roads is the same as in the bill of this year.

Mr. MANN. I am not asking for the total appropriation. I am asking for the total on this item.

Mr. SCOTT. The appropriation on this item in the current law is \$34,000.

Mr. MANN. And in this bill?

Mr. SCOTT. In this particular item there is an increase of \$9,000.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, it is one of the very few items in the bill where there is a substantial increase in the amount appropriated.

Mr. SCOTT. That is very true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not quite understand the gentleman's remarks. Did I understand him to say that if I did not offer the amendment he would not insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. That is the proposition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All right; then I will not offer it.

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the cost of food supplies at the farm and to the consumer, and to disseminate the results of such investigation in whatever manner he may deem best; this authorization to be effective upon the approval of this act.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to argue the point of order further than to call the attention of the Chair to section 520 of the act creating the Department of Agriculture, which I think the Chairman has on his desk. The committee believe that information relating to the cost of food supplies at the farm and to the consumer would be in the nature of useful information on the subject connected with agriculture, and therefore I can not concede the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the Chair that it is very much broader than the authorization, even if that could be construed to authorize a specific provision of this nature. The study of the cost of food supplies is not necessarily limited to the subject of foods that are agricultural products, because there are other food supplies than those produced by agriculture.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the larger include the lesser?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but the lesser does not include the larger. Agriculture does not create all food supplies.

Mr. COCKS of New York. It says food supplies at the farm.

Mr. SHERLEY. It says cost of food supplies at the farm, but not farm food supplies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The paragraph against which a point of order is made proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to investigate the cost of food supplies at the farm and to the consumer and to disseminate the results of such investigation. It further provides that the authorization shall be effective on the approval of this act.

In the opinion of the Chair, this is clearly legislation. Even if it were an appropriation authorizing this on an appropriation bill, it would still be subject to a point of order as something unauthorized by law. It has been heretofore held that the in-

vestigation of foods in their relation to commerce and consumption was not authorized by law in such a way as to permit an appropriation on the agricultural appropriation bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendment whereby the paragraph relating to paper tests was transferred to another part of the bill, and in view of the ruling of the Chair by which the paragraph providing for an investigation of the cost of food supplies is removed, I offer an amendment to strike out the last paragraph of the bill, as it is merely a duplication of language already inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last paragraph. The Clerk read as follows:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$13,417,136.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that that be stricken out.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CAMPBELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18162, the agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the vote will be taken in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SCOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on the Public Lands was discharged from consideration of the bill (H. R. 19407) making an appropriation for the repair and maintenance of the east and south roads into the Yellowstone National Park, and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Tuesday, February 15, may be considered as District day in lieu of Monday, February 14.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that Tuesday, February 15, be substituted as District day in lieu of Monday, February 14. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19255, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to six hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; and, pending that motion, he asks unanimous consent that debate may close in six hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] and the other half by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, pending that request I desire to ask the gentleman from New York if he will not consent to make the time for general debate eight hours? I have requests on this side that will take four hours for general debate, and I would like very much to accommodate these gentlemen who have asked for the time.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not want to be unaccommodating to Members on the other side, neither do I want unnecessarily to occupy the time of the House.

The requests that have been made of me, including the few minutes that I shall myself occupy, I do not think will take three hours. I would suggest that we make it seven hours; and I think, without any question, I can help the gentleman out, for I do not think our side will consume as much as three hours' time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if there is likely to be no expansion of the demand on the gentleman's time, I would suggest that he make it three hours and that he give me four hours of that time.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, that would be unconstitutional. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. Then, I would like to change the gentleman's constitution.

Mr. PERKINS. No; I should insist on the form that one-half should be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like very much to accommodate the gentlemen on this side of the House who have made a request for time. I do not assume that it is an unnecessary consumption of time. Members of this House who desire time for general debate are presumed, and should be presumed, to make such use of that time as will be commendable to this House, to themselves, and to the country.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from New York will accede to the request of the gentleman from Georgia, and for this reason: That it is possible that, as the debate progresses, it may develop requests for time on this side which have not yet been referred to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PERKINS. Very well, then, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to eight hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to eight hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19255, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to occupy but a few minutes in reference to this bill, and as the House is fairly full I think I will do so now. The report of the committee explains fully the items that you are asked to appropriate for in this bill. There is but one large item of increase to which I desire to call the attention of the committee. There is an increase of \$250,000 to be paid to the Republic of Colombia. That is in no way an increase in the cost of the diplomatic and consular service, but this year for the first time we begin under this bill to make appropriations at the rate of \$250,000 a year, to continue for ten years, which are really a part of the cost of the Panama Canal.

By the treaty in connection with that canal we agreed to pay to the Republic of Panama \$250,000 a year, beginning, first, nine years after the making of the treaty, which was modified afterwards so as to begin four years from the time of the making of the treaty. In the meantime it was decided that Panama should pay to Colombia \$2,500,000 in ten annual payments for lands belonging to that Republic which, in connection with the construction of the canal and the organization of the new Republic, had been taken. We have agreed that the payments which we should otherwise make directly to Panama should, until the \$2,500,000 are paid up, be paid to the Republic of Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only item of the bill with reference to which I desire to speak particularly, but I do wish to say just one word more. I may be criticised for repeating what I have so often said, what others have so often said, what the

gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] whom I see sitting in front of me has so often said. The only apology I have to make for this bill is not that it is too large, but that it is too small. It would have given me great pleasure and it would have given the committee great pleasure if we had not recognized the fact that our recommendation would have been subject to a point of order, and it was hopeless that there should be no one in this House who would make the point of order, in this bill to have begun, at least, to make some provision that should be the first provision for a system of appropriations for consular buildings in the East and diplomatic buildings in the great capitals of the West.

I do not intend to occupy any of the time of the committee by arguing this question. More and more I think the people of this country and Members of this body recognize that if the diplomatic and consular service is to be maintained at all it should at least be maintained decently. I am glad to say, so far as it may effect gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, I do not think any more clear, cogent, or forceful argument in favor of the installation of a system of purchase of government buildings for the embassies and consuls of the East was ever made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs than was made two or three years ago by that distinguished Democrat, William J. Bryan, and I trust that his words may sink deep into the hearts of his followers. Now, Mr. Chairman, about the only objection advanced to this is the idea originating in the minds of a good many people, perhaps even in the House of Representatives, that the diplomatic service, at least the embassies and the ministries, to some extent are remnants of a former condition, and that the work of the department and the relations with other nations could to a large extent be carried on, as has sometimes been bluntly stated, by cables and telephones, and that the importance of personal relation has grown less. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that for years the work required of an ambassador or minister may not be critical, but the time comes, and it comes just as much now as it came in the days when there were no railroads and no cables and no telephones, when the personal influence of the right man in the right place is worth to the Government infinite money, and no system of communication can take its place. Take now, Mr. Chairman, what is going on in the city of Washington—not so much by our Representatives, perhaps, as by the representatives sent to us—in the negotiations by which it is sought to reach an agreement between this country and the other great countries, under the Payne bill, so that the maximum tariff may not be declared, and so that an agreement may be made by which the President can certify that in his judgment this country is treated by other nations on terms of equality.

The importance of those negotiations, alike to the countries of Europe and to us, no man can overestimate, and any man who knows anything about it must see the absolute necessity of personal interviews by experienced and able men in order to bring about an agreement. Let me suggest one other incident, and only one, because perhaps it is as notable as any in the annals of our country. The cable was working during the civil war. There was a possibility, as every man knows, after the escape of the *Alabama* and the threatened escape of the other cruisers—and more than a possibility; you might say it was imminent—that a war might arise between this country and England, and if that war had come it surely would have been disastrous and it might have been fatal. There is no man familiar with the history of the country who does not know that the personal influence, the personal contact, the personal appeal, in season and out of season, in public buildings and private houses, of Mr. Adams, our representative at that time, turned the point and saved us from the possibility of war. Those things may come again, Mr. Chairman, and it is surely at this time economy, if we are to preserve this system at all—and preserve it we must—to provide what is necessary for its decent maintenance. And let me make another suggestion to the members of this committee. I am in sympathy with economy as much as any Member of this House, but the manner in which the demand for economy sometimes appears makes me a little tired. When a man talks about economizing and gets very thrifty about his matches, but keeps on drinking his champagne, it does not seem to me that his economy will be largely efficacious. The cost of all the buildings in the East, in China and Japan, that are absolutely requisite for the development of our trade, together with the cost of proper buildings at the embassies—neither so enormous as to require a rich man nor so small as to be unfit for any man—the cost of them all, scattered through a period, say, of ten years, will not exceed, in my judgment, \$5,000,000, one-half the cost of a *Dreadnought*, of which we vote one, two, three, or four, as may be required, every year; and, Mr. Chairman, the \$5,000,000 once spent for housing

our representatives would remain for a hundred years, when the *Dreadnought* would have rotted away at the dock in ten years from the time the last nail was driven into it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And also that \$5,000,000, if properly spent in the foreign capitals, would not only be worth fully as much at the end of that time as it is now, but infinitely more?

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, yes; there is no possible doubt about that. If, for instance, we had bought in the great capitals seats for our representatives at the same time England bought, long ago, for every dollar we paid at that time we could get, assuming that by any possibility we should want to sell, I dare say, \$5 now, and the English embassy in Paris could be sold for many times what it cost.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And here at home, in Washington, after investigating this matter pretty thoroughly a few years ago, I found that it cost the English Government less than 40 cents a foot to buy the property upon which the embassy now stands, and it is worth to-day more than \$10 a foot on the market.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps we had better buy land all over the world. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] yield for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. I surely will.

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman estimate it will cost to have an embassy building of our own at Berlin?

Mr. PERKINS. I think a proper building could be bought there for \$300,000.

Mr. MANN. I will simply say to the gentleman that I am told by a gentleman who is supposed to be expert on these matters, and who is on the gentleman's committee, that it would cost not less than a million dollars.

Mr. PERKINS. That is simply absurd.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This Government has been offered an option on one of the finest buildings in Berlin for less than \$400,000.

Mr. PERKINS. In London, if we bought Dorchester House, it would cost a great deal, but we should buy it. In Paris the Government has been offered a building which may not be ideal, but it seems to me and to the committee that for the purposes of an embassy—not such as some multimillionaire might desire, but so much the better for that—amply sufficient for any proper representation, for between \$300,000 and \$400,000. When a man comes over and says it will cost a million, either he is some multimillionaire or some real-estate agent.

Mr. MANN. I have been told further—and I wish to ask the gentleman's opinion in reference to it—that the State Department has said it would cost a million dollars in the city of Berlin for an embassy building.

Mr. PERKINS. That is rather extreme, because I have looked over, in the State building, with representatives of the State Department, plans of a building which, perhaps, were not all that could be desired.

Mr. MANN. The plans?

Mr. PERKINS. There is a building there on the ground that could be purchased for between \$300,000 and \$400,000. I think the gentleman must have seen some excited representative of the State Department.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will pardon me. The talks I have had have been with members of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I can only give the views of one member of the committee. I have seen those plans. I have talked with the State Department, and I have talked with our representatives both at Berlin and Paris. Unless they are all doing a good deal of fibbing the gentleman has been very largely misinformed.

Mr. HENRY W. PALMER. The gentleman has been misled. Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not been misled. On the contrary, the gentleman helped prepare a bill that is pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs now, which, if they would report, would finally get something out of this thing.

Mr. PERKINS. That may be; but it will not be necessary under that to pay as much as \$1,000,000 for each building.

Mr. MANN. It will not be necessary, but that is the first thing they will ask for when they get the eastern buildings completed—to have a building in Berlin.

Mr. PERKINS. An appropriation for a building that will cost that amount will not come out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as long as it is constituted as it now is.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I would like, with the consent of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS], to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] whether he is opposed to the

general proposition of the Government owning embassies in such capitals as Berlin, London, and Paris?

Mr. MANN. I will answer that question very frankly when it is before the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask how many buildings you provide for in this bill?

Mr. PERKINS. None; because we felt confident that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], or somebody else, would raise a point of order. The proper thing, I think, when any appropriation is to be made, is to make it in a separate bill, and now under our Calendar Wednesday system, fortunately, if you report a bill from the committee you can get it considered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it the plan of the committee to build them all at once—

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (continuing). Or extend them over a term of years?

Mr. PERKINS. The plan of the committee would be, for instance, if there was an offer of a building in Paris or Berlin at the price of three or four hundred thousand dollars, if that seemed proper and was approved by the judgment of those familiar with the situation, the committee would believe in purchasing a single one in a year, and perhaps making an appropriation for a certain amount for work to be done in the consular buildings in the East, which, of course, presents a different proposition, because in many of those places we have to furnish the building, because there is no building that can be used for consular purposes. There is no necessity for erecting buildings for the consular service in Europe, where suitable buildings can always be had.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it the intention of the committee or the plan ultimately to build an embassy building wherever we have a diplomatic representative?

Mr. PERKINS. I should think not. We should buy some embassy buildings. I think that in the great capitals, like London, Paris, Berlin, and St. Petersburg, and in Italy, perhaps, the Government should have its building, but no country, so far as I know, has a building in every small nation to which it may send a minister.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, if you are going to build them for the American representatives abroad who are getting the best salaries, is there not much stronger reason why you should build them at the capitals of countries where the ministers are getting smaller salaries?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentlemen who are getting the best salaries are the worst off. A man of moderate means can take a position as minister and go to Belgium or Portugal and live on his salary respectably; there are no great social expenses. But when he goes to London, Paris, or Berlin he will not have much of the \$17,500 left after he has paid six or seven thousand dollars a year for rent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Illinois commit himself so far as to say whether he will support a bill which would carry no appropriation whatever, but would simply authorize the State Department to acquire at some future time land or buildings for this purpose whenever Congress should appropriate therefor?

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman acquainted with the Lowden bill, pending in the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am very familiar with it.

Mr. MANN. Is the chairman of the committee familiar with that bill?

Mr. PERKINS. I am quite familiar with it.

Mr. MANN. I should say that a bill like the Lowden bill, if presented in the House, not for a million dollars, but half a million dollars a year, might pass through Congress without opposition at all, and that would cover the first year, taking care of the consular buildings in the Far East, the estimate for which a year ago was \$575,000, or something like that.

Mr. PERKINS. Including the building at Shanghai, something more than that should be provided.

Mr. MANN. Possibly. The Lowden bill seems to be very well safeguarded in that direction. It seems to me that a million dollars at the present time is a little too large an amount, but half a million dollars would probably cover all that is necessary. I do not think gentlemen would find any objection to passing a bill of that kind.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am glad to have the gentleman say that.

Mr. MANN. I think that would accomplish all that is necessary at this time. I would be glad to see the bill pass without any opposition. The Lowden bill carries no appropriation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it does.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. The Lowden bill provides for the authorization.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The Lowden bill last year did.

Mr. PERKINS. But not this.

Mr. MANN. The Lowden bill carries an authorization which is well safeguarded, so as to make some provision against extravagant expenditures if some one in the State Department should desire to indulge in making extravagant expenditures, holding the matter in the control of Congress.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman is through, I desire to say one word more, and call the attention of the House to one thing, and I would be glad if through the newspapers some of those outside the House might have their attention called to it, and that is the cost of our consular service. When we are in here asking with all modesty, and there has been considerable delay certainly in receiving an answer, for proper consular housing in the East and diplomatic housing in the West, I would like to state to the House the net cost of the consular service.

We have consuls in every civilized and pretty nearly every uncivilized land. Whatever the consular service may have been in the past—it never was as black as it was painted—it undoubtedly has been vastly improved in the last few years, and it does most valuable work. The import business from the rest of the world, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, is dependent upon the consular service for the proper certificates and documents in order that the goods may be sent from all parts of the world to this country. Everyone will agree with me that the consular service has done work of enormous value in increasing the exports of this country. It has opened new channels of trade. It has sent its reports, some of which have certainly been of very large value, calling the attention of the manufacturers of this country and the producers of this country to new fields for American enterprise, thereby giving our exports a proper outlet as American manufactures become more and more important.

Such is the work done by this service. What do the Members of this House suppose it costs for all this work done over the entire world? Under a bill that we passed a few years ago absolutely all fees are turned into the Treasury. Everybody, high or low, consular clerk or consul-general, is paid a fixed salary from the Government, and receives no more and no less. During the past year the entire expense of the consular service, consuls' assistants, clerks, and all those connected with it, was a little over \$2,000,000. There was received in cash by the Government from fees collected by these consuls \$1,800,000 in round figures. In other words, the net cost of the consular service during the year last past was \$249,000. That is less than we spend every year to check the onward progress of the gypsy moth; and if there is any other branch of the Government that for the expenditure of \$249,000 can show work like that done by the consular service, covering hundreds of millions of dollars of commerce between this country and other countries, I am not familiar with it. Surely, Mr. Chairman, with such results, the consular service of the United States deserves our commendation, our support, and our pride. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour, or so much of it as he may require, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the matter which I propose to discuss is the question of federal incorporation. I presume I shall use the entire hour, which is about fifteen minutes more time than I have ever before taken to make a speech in the House, but I do not see how I can occupy any less time. Is it the desire of the committee to remain in session for another hour this afternoon?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19255, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CLEARANCES AND SAILINGS FROM UNITED STATES PORTS.

Mr. GREENE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I ask unanimous consent to print as a House document, for the use of the Members of the House, a statement showing clearances and sailings from United States ports during the six months ending December 31, 1909, of mail and commercial steamers. (H. Doc. No. 641.)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no argument in favor of a ship subsidy in it, is there?

Mr. GREENE. Not at all. It is simply what its title indicates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 19783) amending section 38 of the act of August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 19548. An act prescribing certain provisions and conditions under which bonds and certificates of indebtedness of the United States may be issued, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3983. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. L., 302), entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," and all amendments thereto—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 614. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Dewitt Eastman," approved January 8, 1909—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Dog River, Mississippi (H. Doc. No. 642)—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Alpheus Truett against The United States (H. Doc. No. 640)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Hackensack River, New Jersey (H. Doc. No. 643)—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. Statement showing the clearances and sailing from United States ports during the six months ended December 31, 1909, of mail and commercial steamers (H. Doc. No. 641)—ordered to be printed as a House document.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12397) granting certain rights and privileges to the department of fisheries of the State of Pennsylvania, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 381), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19399) to extend the time for the completion of bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., by the St. Louis Electric Bridge Company, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 382), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18902) to amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 383), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the Senate, reported in lieu thereof a bill (S. 5574) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 380), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19558) to authorize the Secretary of War to effect an exchange of a certain parcel of land owned by the United States for another parcel owned by the Cave Hill Cemetery Company, of Louisville, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 384), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1324) for the relief of James J. Elliott, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 385), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18633) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Sandland, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POINDEXTER: A bill (H. R. 20039) appropriating \$196,000 for the erection of necessary buildings upon the United States Military Reservation at Fort George Wright, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 20040) to establish a fish-culture station in the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 20041) for the improvement of Sapelo Harbor, in Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 20042) providing for the erection of a public building at Fort Morgan, Ala., for the use of the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20043) to amend and reenact section 15 of an act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States, approved February 2, 1901—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS: A bill (H. R. 20044) to authorize the Fort Smith and Van Buren district to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River at Van Buren, in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20045) to regulate the hours of labor on contracts with the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: A bill (H. R. 20046) to erect a monument to the memory of John Summerfield Staples at Stroudsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 20047) providing for the construction of 8 ice piers in the Susquehanna River at and near Port Deposit, in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 20048) to provide for the erection of a public building at Flemingsburg, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20049) to provide for the erection of a public building at Augusta, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20050) to provide for the erection of a public building at Carlisle, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 20107) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 20108) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: Resolution (H. Res. 368) providing for the consideration of Senate joint resolution 59—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEISSE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) compelling the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to compile and publish a monthly statement showing the imports and exports on classification of tanned leather—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 137) to continue in full force and effect an act entitled "An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 34) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report on the Star Spangled Banner, Hail Columbia, America, and Yankee Doodle—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 20051) for the relief of the estate of Fritz Eggert, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20052) granting an increase of pension to Jose Baca—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 20053) to correct the military record of Charles Hilbert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 20054) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 20055) granting an increase of pension to Reuben T. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 20056) granting an increase of pension to John Faris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20057) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of John Potter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 20058) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20059) granting an increase of pension to William L. Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 20060) for the relief of W. H. De Long—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 20061) granting a pension to William L. McFarland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 20062) for the relief of Sarah Jane Pirtle, widow, and the heirs of John W. Pirtle, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20063) granting an increase of pension to James Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 20064) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROW: A bill (H. R. 20065) granting a pension to Elizabeth Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 20066) granting a pension to Jacob B. S. Rice—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 20067) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 20068) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOELKER: A bill (H. R. 20069) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Doyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20070) granting a pension to Annie Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 20071) for the relief of George J. Consigny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 20072) for the relief of Hans N. Anderson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 20073) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. McClellan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 20074) for the relief of the estate of Marilda F. Sims, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20075) for the relief of the estate of Thomas B. Posey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20076) for the relief of the estate of Ann Fields, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20077) for the relief of the estate of David L. Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20078) for the relief of David N. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 20079) granting a pension to Sarah E. Penny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20080) for the relief of Allison W. Polard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20081) for the relief of James B. Bazell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20082) for the relief of Moses J. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 20083) to reimburse J. H. Whealton for moneys paid by him as surety for C. W. Fullerton, late postmaster of Whealton, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20084) granting an increase of pension to Westley Shonafelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20085) granting an increase of pension to J. T. Axline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20086) granting an increase of pension to George Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20087) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Groft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20088) granting an increase of pension to Angus C. McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 20089) granting an increase of pension to Royal Yeamans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20090) granting an increase of pension to Charles Triquet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 20091) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Sandland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20092) granting an increase of pension to Corydon M. Turnbull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20093) granting an increase of pension to James R. Cruson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 20094) granting a pension to Julia A. Russ—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20095) granting an increase of pension to Alexis Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 20096) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20097) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20098) granting an increase of pension to William T. Soward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 20099) granting an increase of pension to D. S. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20100) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Fisher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20101) granting an honorable discharge to Elias Branham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20102) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Comer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 20103) for the relief of Augustus B. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 20104) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert M. Everham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 20105) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Very, jr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 20106) granting an increase of pension to Americus Rhodes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Association of American Agricultural College and Experiment Stations, praying for the printing and distribution of the report of the Country Life Commission—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Spokane (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, praying for an increase of salaries of the justices of the Supreme, circuit, and district courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse, praying for legislation for the improvement of rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Harry Moss and 49 other citizens of Paris, Ill., protesting against the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of O. G. Fielding and 19 others, of Hillsboro County, Fla., protesting against the limitations of the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph Svoboda and Phillip Svoboda, of Nebraska, protesting against an increase in the postal rates on periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse, praying for legislation for the encouragement of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Boston, gathered in Faneuil Hall, praying for such legislation as shall reduce the prices of the necessities of life—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Petition of citizens of Larchmont, N. Y., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of American Insurance Union, favoring the measure of the National Fraternal Press Association embodied in House bill 17543—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Underwriters of Fire Insurance, against House bill 13862—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, for repeal of corporation feature of the tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Petition of R. G. Brandenburg and other citizens of Cedar Hill, Tex., against postal savings-bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Flemingsburg, Ky., against a postal savings-bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Oakmont, Pa., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of Kansas legislature, favoring Senate bill 1000—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Oscar Law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUDREY: Petition of R. J. Larkland and other citizens of St. Louis, against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Gold Hill Grange, No. 326, Patrons of Husbandry, against increase in second-class postage rates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of California Division of the Travelers' Protective Association, for ship subsidy—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council; Vallejo Lodge, No. 252, International Association of Machinists; and Vallejo Lodge, No. 148, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Ship Builders, regarding reorganization of the navy as per Secretary Meyer's plan—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of D. N. Hann and 68 others, favoring National Tribune pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Fall Creek, Wis., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gale H. Lotz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Postal Defense League, of Chicago, Ill., concerning the proposed increase of postage on second-class matter, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Sunny Brook Distillery Company, of Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the corporation-tax law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Protective Tariff League, against reopening the question of tariff revision, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Treble Clef Club, against the use of Hetch Hetchy Valley as a water reservoir for San Francisco—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HELM: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Mary H. Letcher, executrix of estate of Thomas K. Letcher; the estate of Joseph M. Moss; John H. Engleman, administrator of estate of John Engleman, sr.; the heirs of Monroe Curtis; the estate of David L. Scott; and the estate of Marilda F. Sims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Creighton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Seals—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, against a postal savings-bank law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Maritime Association of New York City, favoring publication of maritime charts by the Hydrographic Office—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of citizens of Mount Joy, Pa., and vicinity, against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Flamsburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: Petition of citizens of De Soto, Wis., against the Johnson Sunday bill (S. 404) for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of William H. Aitken, Rudolph Papst, and other citizens of Michigan, favoring a Union officers' civil war volunteer retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: Petition of B. Johnson, of Ilion, and Charles Williamson and W. H. Shepard, of Frankfort, N. Y., against increasing postage on second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Columbia Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, against change in oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Julia A. Russ, widow of Hiram Miller, and Alex Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Jesse Weatherlee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of W. Givens and others, against increase of postal rate on periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUCKER of Colorado: Petition of New Windsor Socialist Local of the International Socialist party, protesting against the action of the municipal authorities of Spokane, Wash., in relation to the arrest of so-called Socialist speakers, signed by 32 residents of New Windsor, Colo.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens in various towns of Yuma, Boulder, Washington, and Weld counties, Colo., against sectarian legislation and a proposed bill (S. 404) relating to the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHARP: Petition of citizens of Oberlin, Ohio, against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Joyce Chapter, of the Brotherhood of Methodist Church, of Lorain, Ohio, against cornering of food supplies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of citizens of Tennessee, for legislation against gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of representative deaf of Hartford, Conn., favoring an appropriation of \$5,000 in aid of the World's Congress of the Deaf—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, W. Va., against postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Maritime Association of Port of New York, favoring compilation of pilot charts, to be kept in hands of Hydrographic Office—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Lima Chapter, No. 6, American Insurance Union, favoring enactment of House bill 17543—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Steadman Grange, No. 241, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ashville, N. Y., against any change in the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Harmony Grange, No. 694, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ashville, N. Y., and Portville Grange, No. 842, Patrons of Husbandry, of Portville, N. Y., against any change in the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 4, 1910.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

INCREASED COST OF PRODUCTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th ultimo, certain information relative to the increase in the price of various food and other products (S. Doc. No. 349) which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CRAWFORD subsequently said: This morning during my absence the Department of Commerce and Labor made a report in answer to Senate resolution 125, and I understand it was referred to the Committee on Finance. I have looked at the report, and it simply contains information which should go to the country. The response to the resolution appears to be complete. I desire, if it is proper, to ask that the report, which will be printed as a public document, may lie on the table. I may wish to call it up to make some remarks upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAGE in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota asks that the report may be recalled from the Committee on Finance and that it may lie on the table. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company for the year ended December 31, 1909, being a substitute for the annual report submitted on January 14, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 542, pt. 2), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON TRANSIT COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company of Maryland for the year ended December 31, 1909 (H. Doc. No. 650), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Brown, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 18162) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15384) making appropriation for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HULL of Iowa, Mr. PRINCE, and Mr. SULZER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18282) mak-

ing appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1910, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TAWNEY, Mr. MALBY, and Mr. BOWERS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation restricting in the District of Columbia the writing of insurance contracts to admitted stock companies, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of Erie Chapter, No. 253, American Insurance Union, of Erie; of Rural Valley Chapter, No. 71, American Insurance Union, of Rural Valley; and of Mount Queen Chapter, No. 113, American Insurance Union, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the rate of postage on periodicals, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Athens, of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Tarentum, and of sundry citizens of Bolivia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Hawaii, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Pittsburgh Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club, of Pittsburgh, and a memorial of the C. A. Woolsey Paint and Color Company, of Jersey City, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Heyburn paint bill," which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to eliminate grade crossings connecting with the navy-yard, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation restricting in the District of Columbia the writing of insurance contracts to admitted stock companies, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Benning Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying that an appropriation be made for the reclamation of the Anacostia Flats and the improvement of the Anacostia River, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of members of the Bar Association of Chicago, Ill., and a petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present interstate-commerce law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Trenton, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "postal savings-bank bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry merchants and manufacturers of Decatur, Ill., praying for the repeal of the corporation-tax law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of the Methodist and Presbyterian Preachers' Meeting, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Burkett antigambling bill" to prohibit the interstate transmission of race-gambling bets, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the National Live Stock Exchange, remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Indiana State Association of Master House Painters and Decorators, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "Heyburn paint bill," which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present interstate-commerce law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Council Bluffs, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the rate of postage on periodicals, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Gilmore City, Promise City, Silver City, Dayton, and Fort Dodge, all in